5584. Also, petition of R. W. Lorr and other citizens of Toledo, Ohio, urging support of the Townsend recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5585. By Mr. TURNER: Petition of Edith Clerk, of Lawrenceburg, Tenn., requesting Congress to pass a uniform Federal old-age-pension law that must be adopted by the States before any Federal aid or relief is available; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5586. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Monterey Park, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5587. Also, petition of James Yearsley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5588. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of the Nebraska House of Representatives, protesting against imposition of a processing tax on livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 1935

(Legislative day of Wednesday, Mar. 13, 1935)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, March 23, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6511) to amend the air mail laws and to authorize the extension of the Air Mail Service, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the bequest of the late Charlotte Taylor, of the city of St. Petersburg, State of Florida, for the benefit of Walter Reed General Hospital, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TWENTIETH PLENARY ASSEMBLY, INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE ON COMMERCE

Mr. ROBINSON. I present a communication from the Secretary of State, with memoranda attached, and ask that the communication and memoranda be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the communication from the Secretary of State, with the attached memoranda, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 25, 1935.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith for your information and consideration a copy of a despatch dated February 21, 1935, from the American Embassy at Brussels, and its enclosure, a translation of an invitation from the secretary general of the International Parliamentary Conference on Commerce for this Government to be represented at the Twentieth Plenary Assembly which will be held in London on October 1, 1935. The agenda mentioned in the secretary general's letter will be forwarded to you as soon as it is received.

Invitations for the congress to be represented at the eighteenth Conference in Rome in 1933 and at the nineteenth Conference in Belgrade in 1934 have been previously transmitted by the Department, and in the present instance I should be pleased to receive an indication of the views of the Senate with regard to this invitation in order that an appropriate reply may be made to the secretary general of the Conference.

The invitation has also been referred to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Very sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

BRUSSELS, *February 21, 1935.*

Subject: International Parliamentary Conference on Commerce.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

SIR: I have the honor to refer to the Department's instruction no. 108 of August 6, 1934, and to enclose a copy and translation of a letter addressed to the Ambassador by Mr. Eugene Baie, secretary general of the International Parliamentary Conference on Commerce, inviting participation by the American Government in the Twentieth Plenary Assembly of the Conference, which will convene at Westminster Palace in London on October 1, 1935.

Ordinarily the Embassy requests nongovernmental organizations of this sort to convey their invitations through the Belgian Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Belgian Embassy in Washington to the American Government. But since Mr. Baie was good enough to furnish the Embassy with copies of data requested by the Department in its instruction no. 729 of April 25, 1933, relating to the eighteenth assembly of the Conference which met in Rome that year, the Embassy saw no objection to transmitting his invitation with this despatch.

Respectfully yours,

DAVE H. MORRIS.

[Translation]

BRUSSELS, *February 15, 1935.*

His Excellency Mr. DAVE HENNEN MORRIS,
Ambassador of the United States at Brussels.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to ask you to be good enough to transmit to your country an invitation to be represented at the Twentieth Plenary Assembly of our Conference which, with the consent of the British Government and the authorities of the House of Commons, will take place at the Palace of Westminster on October 1, at the time of the royal jubilee. The agenda of this assembly, which will be an exceptionally interesting one, will be forwarded to you later. We are confident that your country will take advantage of this occasion to give evidence of its cordial sentiments both toward Great Britain, which will celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the reign of its sovereign, and toward the commercial committee of the House of Lords, at whose suggestion our organization was founded.

Up to the present the United States has been represented at our assemblies by observers only. But present changed economic conditions and the services resulting from the continuity and the substantial character of our work encourage us to hope that our invitation will receive serious consideration. The value of continued contacts in the economic field, exclusive of all political factors, among legislators of all States, seems unquestionable. And we express the hope that the meeting in London will form the occasion for the United States to occupy in our assemblies the important place which is its due.

Accept, Excellency, the expression of my high consideration.

EUGENE BAIE,
The Secretary General of the Conference.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the matter to which I am about to advert is not important, but on account of some confusion and several communications I have received from my constituents threatening various things to me, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Herald of yesterday entitled "Hoover Leaves on Motor Trip."

This article is dated "Palo Alto, Calif., March 24, by the United Press." There is some confusion in names. The name of the distinguished chairman of the Republican National Committee is Henry P. Fletcher. The article to which I wish to enter a disclaimer states:

Chairman DUNCAN U. FLETCHER and scores of other party chieftains and Republican business leaders—

And so forth.

I have sins enough of my own to answer for without being loaded with those of others, and I wish to make a correction. The reference evidently is to the chairman of the Republican National Committee, and not to the senior Senator from Florida.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOVER LEAVES ON MOTOR TRIP

PALO ALTO, CALIF., March 24.—Former President Hoover stepped back into his role of "private citizen" today, evading the spotlight focused on him by his energetically worded letter to the California Republican Assembly.

With Mrs. Hoover, he left his Stanford University home early in the day for a motor trip south. Congratulatory telegrams from Republican chiefs poured into the Hoover home. Paul Sexson, secretary to Mr. Hoover, said that more than 100 such messages, "all of them most enthusiastic in tone", had been received.

Chairman DUNCAN U. FLETCHER and scores of other party chieftains and Republican business leaders sent the telegrams, Mr. Sexson said.

It was indicated the next political statement he may make would not be forthcoming until he has visited New York. Mr. Hoover is scheduled to go there next week to attend a meeting of the New York Life Insurance Co. board of directors. Mr. Sexson said the trip would be one devoted to business alone, similar to one made several weeks ago.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Costigan	Lonergan	Robinson
Ashurst	Couzens	Long	Russell
Austin	Cutting	McAdoo	Schall
Bachman	Dickinson	McCarran	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Donahey	McGill	Sheppard
Barbour	Duffy	McKellar	Shipstead
Barkley	Fletcher	McNary	Smith
Bilbo	Frazier	Maloney	Steiwer
Black	George	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gerry	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Moore	Townsend
Bulkley	Glass	Murphy	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Murray	Truman
Burke	Guffey	Neely	Tydings
Byrd	Hale	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Clark	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh
Connally	King	Pope	Wheeler
Coolidge	La Follette	Radcliffe	
Copeland	Logan	Reynolds	

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent because of illness, and that the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on account of illness; that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] and the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] are absent on official business, and that the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are necessarily detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for the month of February 1935, together with a statement of authorizations made during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES AT HOWARD UNIVERSITY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 107 (agreed to Mar. 16, 1935), a report relating to an investigation of alleged irregularities at Howard University, Washington, D. C., during the latter part of 1934 and to date, which with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents in the Veterans' Administration which are not needed in the transaction of the current business of the Administration and have no permanent value or historical interest, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. HARRISON and Mr. COUZENS as members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration:

Assembly Joint Resolution 31

Memorializing Congress to appropriate sufficient funds and enact additional legislation to provide a comprehensive plan for the deporting of undesirable aliens and aliens who are illegally within this Nation

Whereas the United States Department of Labor is and has been charged with the duty of deporting from this Nation undesirable aliens and aliens who are illegally in this Nation; and

Whereas it has been publicly stated that funds are not available in sufficient quantity to permit active, militant action in the matter of illegally entered or undesirable aliens; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Legislature of the State of California that the Department of Labor requests the full cooperation of the United States Department of Justice in the deporting of undesirable aliens and aliens who are illegally in this country; and

Whereas the Departments of Labor and Justice have limited funds available for the carrying out of this important duty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests and memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide permanent bureaus of record free from political interference or interruption, to carry on a continuous investigation of all subversive activities in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That this Legislature respectfully requests and memorializes the Congress of the United States to make such immediate appropriations as needed to carry on this extensive investigation and that any and all additional laws be enacted by the Congress of the United States as will further the extensive plan as proposed by the Departments of Justice and Labor.

Assembly Joint Resolution 32

Memorializing Congress to prepare proper legislation providing for the deportation of aliens who are dependent upon public relief

Whereas the problem of public relief is of paramount importance to every city, county, State, and the Federal Government, and as the projects of public relief in every community, State, and the Nation find thousands of instances in which aliens having failed to apply for citizenship in the United States are enjoying such benefits; and

Whereas the prerequisite of admission to citizenship requires that aliens submit proof that they are not likely to become a public charge; and

Whereas the problem of unemployment for our citizens is distinctly hampered in consequence of the competition of aliens occupying public relief jobs in this country and receiving assistance from public relief projects to the obvious detriment of our own people either directly or indirectly; and

Whereas it is the duty of the city, county, State, and Federal Government to provide primarily for its citizens and taxpayers who are confronted with the impossibility of maintaining their own existence by gainful labors in commerce and industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests and memorializes the Congress of the United States to pass immediately national legislation requiring the deportation of all unemployed aliens now dependent upon public charity and relief and those who may be occupying positions of employment on relief projects under the administration of any city, county, State, or the Federal Government; and it is further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests and memorializes that in order to not impose undue hardship on those aliens having accustomed themselves to our standards of living that an exemption from the provisions of such proposed legislation be granted to such aliens over 60 years of age who have resided continuously in the United States for a period of 20 or more years.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, favoring the enactment of legislation imposing an immediate tariff on pulpwood and newsprint paper, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. SHIPSTEAD on the 23d instant, p. 4342, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, fa-

voring a protective tariff on barley and other farm products, and requesting the national administration not to make further reciprocal tariff or trade agreements to the detriment of the interests of the American farmers, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented today by Mr. DUFFY.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for the repeal or modification of the long- and short-haul provisions of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented today by Mr. KING.)

He also laid before the Senate a petition of the Citizens' Joint Committee on Fiscal Relations between the United States and the District of Columbia, favoring an increase in the amount appropriated on the part of the United States toward the support of the government of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Arkansas, California, Mississippi, and Oklahoma, praying for the enactment of old-age-pension legislation, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Jackson and the Rotary Club of Ruleville, both in the State of Mississippi, protesting against the ratification of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Deep Waterway Treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Film and Photo League, the German Workers' Club, the Somarian Y Circle Club, Paperhangers' Local Union No. 490, and Butcher Union No. 174, all of New York City, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of alien and sedition legislation tending to suppress civil rights, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also laid before the Senate petitions numerously signed by citizens of various States praying the immediate passage of legislation designed to halt the activities of individuals and organizations within our country seeking to overthrow our Government by force and violence, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Connecticut, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, and Virginia, praying for an investigation of charges filed by the Women's Committee on Louisiana relative to the qualifications of the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. LONG and Mr. OVERTON], which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y.; the Common Council of the Borough of Sayreville, N. J.; and the City Council of Monterey Park, Calif., favoring the enactment of pending legislation proclaiming October 11 in each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WALSH presented a resolution adopted at Wilmington, Del., by the Electrical Contractors' Association of Delaware, favoring an extension of the National Industrial Recovery Act for 2 years, with certain necessary changes to make the law more effective, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Polish American Democratic Club, of Chicopee, Mass., favoring the enactment of old-age-pension legislation, unemployment insurance, and a 30-hour work-week for industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the City Council of Fitchburg, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the payment of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Finnish Federation of Lowell, Mass., protesting against the enactment of legislation penalizing mere utterance in the absence of overt acts, increasing the powers of censorship over the mails by the Post Office Department, creating any agency to deal with activities because of their political or economic character, or adding restrictions on political opinion in controlling immigration and deportation, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Holy Name Society of St. Laurence O'Toole's Church, of Lawrence, Mass., protesting against alleged religious persecutions in Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DUFFY presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Joint resolution relating to a protective tariff on barley and barley malt

Whereas the press reports that negotiations are under way for a reciprocal trade treaty between the United States and Canada with a probable 50-percent reduction in the import duty of malt from Canada; and

Whereas in 1934, in spite of protective tariffs, nearly 6,000,000 bushels of foreign malt and a surprisingly large quantity of foreign barley entered the United States; and

Whereas the foregoing report comes to the Wisconsin Legislature, which recently adopted and forwarded to Washington a joint resolution (no. 31) urging the Congress to enact an adequate protective tariff to protect the products of American farms against foreign competition and to save the home market for the American farmer, to whom it rightfully belongs; and

Whereas the reported reciprocal trade treaty negotiations and reduction in import duty, above referred to, serve to substantiate the thought expressed in the resolution heretofore adopted that "the farmers of foreign countries are better represented at Washington and are more the concern of the administration than are the farmers of the United States of America": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature respectfully refers the Congress of the United States to Joint Resolution No. 31 heretofore adopted and forwarded to the Congress by this legislature, and again memorializes the Congress to provide a protective tariff adequate to protect the American production of barley and other farm products against foreign competition, and requests the national administration not to make further reciprocal tariff or trade agreements by which the interests of the American farmers are sacrificed; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to both Houses of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

Mr. KING submitted the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Memorializing the Congress of the United States of America for the purpose of opposing passage of (1) H. R. 3263, which bill has for its objective the repeal of the long- and short-haul provisions of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, or (2) any other bills that may be introduced in the Congress having for their objective the repealing or modification of the said long- and short-haul provisions of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Utah, respectfully represent that—

Whereas prior to the year 1920, freight charges on shipments originating in the central and the eastern portions of the United States and terminating in the State of Utah (or vice versa) were higher than on shipments of the same traffic which moved between the East and the Pacific coast, although said shipments passed right through the State of Utah. In fact, in many instances and for a long period of time the freight charges from the East to the State of Utah (or vice versa) were constructed by adding the low overhead rates from and to the Pacific coast to the local or backhaul rates and charges from the Pacific coast to Utah (or vice versa), which charges became known as "back-haul charges"; and

Whereas such discriminatory freight rates and charges placed a severe burden upon the shoulders of all types of industries endeavoring to operate in the State of Utah and also discouraged new industries from locating in this State; and

Whereas, in 1920, as a result of these discriminatory and unreasonable practices of the railroad common carriers, the Congress of the United States of America declared it unlawful for said railroad common carriers to make lower freight rates and charges for longer than for shorter hauls when the shorter haul is in the same route as the longer haul, with the exception that such departure would be permissive when authority was granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission under certain reasonable restrictions; said law is now known as the "long- and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act"; and

Whereas in the administration of this law the Interstate Commerce Commission—a most qualified, disinterested, and impartial judge—has, with few exceptions, consistently refused to permit a return of such discriminatory freight charges, although the rail carriers have been persistent in seeking such departures from said fourth section; and

Whereas by reason of this fact, a strong effort is being made to strip the Interstate Commerce Commission of its present power, in the form of H. R. 3263, which, if enacted, would completely repeal this protective long- and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act; and

Whereas Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, Federal Coordinator of Transportation, appointed by the President of the United States, has, in the pursuance of his duties, recommended to the Congress of the United States of America that said long- and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act be neither repealed nor emasculated, and that this same recommendation was made by the legislative committee of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and both of these recommendations are of recent origin, having been submitted during the early part of the year 1934;

Now, therefore, your memorialists urgently request that the Congress of the United States of America do not pass said H. R. 3263 or any other bill having for its intent or purpose the repeal or modification in any degree whatsoever of the long- and short-haul provisions of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act: Be it

Resolved, That this memorial be sent to each of the Representatives of the congressional delegation from the State of Utah to the United States Congress and to each Member of said Congress.

Mr. BARBOUR presented the following concurrent resolution of the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

A concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to pass immediately "A bill to provide relief to depositors in closed national banks; to promote resumption of industrial activity, increase employment, and restore confidence by fulfillment of the implied guaranty by the United States Government of deposit safety in national banks"

Whereas millions of dollars of the life's savings of millions of depositors are now frozen and unavailable in closed national banks; and

Whereas millions of dollars of valuable securities, assets in closed national banks, are now being liquidated at a greatly depreciated value; and

Whereas unless immediate relief is given to the millions of depositors in closed national banks they will lose their homes; and

Whereas unless immediate relief is given to the thousands of small business enterprises whose assets are frozen in closed national banks they will be unable to struggle along any further in the maintenance of their business; and

Whereas unless immediate relief is given to the millions of depositors and thousands of small business enterprises the present army of unemployed and suffering human beings will necessarily increase to alarming proportions; and

Whereas there is not any adequate means of refinancing the millions of depositors and thousands of small business enterprises, leaving them at the mercy of their mortgagees and creditors throughout this State and Nation; and

Whereas one of the most deplorable conditions of today is the economic suffering of millions of depositors in closed national banks; and

Whereas such conditions strike at the very foundation of our lives and our Government, tending, if unabated, to result in absolute disregard and disruption of our moral, social, and governmental life, resulting in chaos and internal strife; and

Whereas it is of vital importance to the welfare of the people and the Government of the United States that all things be done to promote the stability of the economic life of our people and the government of the State of New Jersey and all other States throughout the Union; and

Whereas it rests within the power of Congress to protect and maintain our moral, social, and governmental life by the enactment of a bill to provide relief to depositors in closed national banks, sponsored and introduced by the Honorable W. WARREN BARBOUR and the Honorable A. HARRY MOORE, United States Senators from the State of New Jersey: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the senate concurring):

1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to give relief to the depositors in closed national banks by the immediate passage of the following bill sponsored and introduced in the Seventy-fourth Congress by the Honorable W. WARREN BARBOUR and the Honorable A. HARRY MOORE:

"A bill to provide relief to depositors in closed national banks; to promote resumption of industrial activity, increase employment, and restore confidence by fulfillment of the implied guaranty by the United States Government of deposit safety in national banks

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase and acquire from the receivers or conservators of closed national banks all remaining assets of such banks which date of closing was on or after January 1, 1930. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, upon application by the receivers or conservators of such closed banks, and upon receipt of such remaining assets, shall immediately make available to such receivers or conservators, as payment for such assets, funds sufficient to pay 60 percent due on the proved claims of depositors in such closed banks.

"SEC. 2. If in the reorganization or reopening of any bank any depositor shall have taken capital stock or other form of property for his deposit, or any part thereof, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to purchase of such depositors, on application, such portion of said capital stock or other property, as will enable said depositor to receive 60 percent in cash on his deposit after deducting whatever payment or credit said depositor has received in cash.

"SEC. 3. That upon the transfer of their remaining assets to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and upon receipt of the funds received as payment therefor, the receivers or conservators of such closed banks shall immediately arrange to disburse such funds to the depositors of such banks: *Provided, however*, That where depositors' obligations, notes, etc., which have been pledged to the R. F. C. or other Federal agency, then in that case, the R. F. C. shall be subrogated to the depositors' rights to the amount due them from the depositors' share of 60 percent.

"SEC. 4. That the assets so purchased shall be liquidated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and, with the exception of assets in the form of unsecured notes, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall allow debtors a period of not to exceed 10 years in which to pay their indebtedness as evidenced by such assets. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall have full discretion concerning terms of liquidation of assets in the form of unsecured notes and may, when it deems such a course advisable, insist upon such terms of payment and such additional security from the debtor as it may deem advisable. No owner of stock in bank affected by the provisions of this act shall be relieved of any assessment or other liability to which he is subject under any existing Federal or State law previous to enactment of this act. The assessment liability of stockholders within the meaning of this act shall be construed as asset and as such shall be included with any and all other assets so purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"SEC. 5. That regardless of any previous contract or agreement on the part of any person, the rate of interest paid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on such assets by the debtors shall be reduced to 4 percent per annum, and that for the purposes of this act any statute of limitations shall be waived and held not to apply to any transaction referred to or covered by provisions of this act. Nothing herein contained, however, shall prevent any debtor from anticipating payment on any such indebtedness."

2. That copies of this resolution, duly certified by the speaker and the clerk of the house of assembly, respectively, be forthwith transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Honorable W. WARREN BARBOUR and the Honorable A. HARRY MOORE, United States Senators from New Jersey, the sponsors of this measure.

3. That this concurrent resolution shall take effect immediately.

Mr. NORRIS presented the following resolution of the Senate of the State of Nebraska, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to promote, initiate, and support any legislation for the purpose of requiring all motor-vehicle fuels to contain ethyl alcohol in a volume of not less than 10 percent of the mixture

Whereas a fuel for internal combustion engines has been developed consisting of 10 percent or more of ethyl alcohol made from agricultural products with gas; and

Whereas the use of ethyl alcohol mixed with gas has passed the experimental stage and been proved in foreign countries and by many tests in this country to increase the mileage and power obtainable from each gallon of fuel; and

Whereas a number of foreign countries, including Germany and France, require that each gallon of gas contain as high as 25 percent of ethyl alcohol, and use of such mixture has proved successful in said countries; and

Whereas the manufacturers of the alcohol used in producing this new fuel would provide a large market for the surplus corn from which the alcohol is made, thus supplying a market for corn that was practically wiped out by the substitution of the use of motor vehicles for the use of horses; and

Whereas this new market would tend to raise the price of corn and agricultural commodities and thereby improve conditions in the agricultural regions now prostrated and would furnish the gasoline consumer with a fuel equal to the best grade of gas; and

Whereas many tests have demonstrated the advisability of a mixture containing 10 percent of such ethyl alcohol or more; and

Whereas it is the sense of this senate that the highest percentage of alcohol obtainable for use in the aforesaid fuel should be required by legislation to give the utmost aid and benefit to agricultural regions and thereby speed and promote national prosperity: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nebraska in its fiftieth session assembled:

SECTION 1. That the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Members of Congress from Nebraska, and the Congress be urged to promote, initiate, and support any legislation for the purpose of requiring all motor-vehicle fuels to contain ethyl alcohol made

from surplus agricultural products grown within the continental limits of the United States in a volume of not less than 10 percent of the mixture.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Members of the United States Senate, and Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS also presented the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact no livestock processing taxes

Whereas there is a proposal before the Congress of the United States to place a processing tax on livestock supposedly for the purpose of aiding the farmers and livestock men in the Middle West; and

Whereas the passage of such an act would not benefit those persons supposed to receive benefits of such proposed legislation, but would hinder and harm such persons in their property and business; and

Whereas the farmers and livestock men in this State are unalterably opposed to the principle of enacting processing taxes on livestock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, in fiftieth session assembled:

1. That this house respectfully petitions and memorializes the Congress of the United States not to pass any additional livestock processing taxes of any kind, as it is the sense of our people in Nebraska that such processing taxes upon livestock are detrimental to the best interests of farmers and livestock men in our State.

2. That the chief clerk of this house is hereby ordered and directed forthwith to forward a copy of this resolution, properly authenticated and suitably engrossed, to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each United States Senator and Congressman representing the State of Nebraska in the Congress of the United States, to the end that our Senators and Representatives, acting in concert, shall, without delay, take such necessary steps to protect our rights and to prevent the enactment of any legislation by the Congress for placing a processing tax upon Nebraska livestock.

Mr. COPELAND presented resolutions adopted by Lincoln Council, No. 10, of Brooklyn, and Oceanside Council, No. 114, of Oceanside, of the Junior Order American Mechanics, all in the State of New York, favoring the passage of legislation reducing immigration by 40 percent, and creating in the Department of Justice a Bureau of Alien Deportations, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Women's Auxiliary of Syracuse (N. Y.) Post, No. 41, American Legion, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing that religious views or philosophical opinions against war or the bearing of arms in defense of this country shall not debar aliens otherwise qualified from citizenship, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Kings Highway Youth Branch of the American League Against War and Fascism, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of alien and sedition legislation to suppress civil rights, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the People's Open Forum, of Jamestown, N. Y., favoring the enactment of unemployment insurance, old-age pension, and social-security legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Long Island Chamber of Commerce, of New York City, and the Lions Club, of Brewster, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of legislation inimical to public utility companies, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Greece Central Parent-Teacher Association, of Greece, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to establish a national film institute in the Department of the Interior, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Warsaw Village Board, of Warsaw, and Seneca Grange, No. 284, Patrons of Husbandry, of Stanley, in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation to regulate motor vehicles engaged in interstate commerce, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Syracuse (N. Y.) Association of Credit Men, favoring amendments to the present bankruptcy act relating to credit matters, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

He also presented a resolution adopted by the United Spanish War Veterans, Samuel M. Porter Camp, No. 45, of Jamestown, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation making it a crime to advocate or promote the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and providing for the exclusion and expulsion of alien Communists, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Stanley B. Pennock Post, No. 2893, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Solvay, and Wolfe Tone Council of the American Association for Recognition of the Irish Republic, of New York City, all in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of Commodore John Barry, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of Commodore John Barry, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

OPERATIONS OF N. R. A.

Mr. WAGNER presented a telegram from G. A. Copeland, treasurer of Brack Container Corporation, of Rochester, N. Y., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *March 25, 1935.*

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate:

Following statistics are foundation demanding you support President fight continuing N. R. A. 2 more years: Operate small box factory employing 60 people; 1932 pay roll, $42,000; 1934 pay roll, $61,000. Raw materials purchased: 1932, $116,000; 1934, $236,000. Believe N. R. A. alone responsible for upturn. Respectfully ask you wire immediately how you will vote on this issue.

G. A. COPELAND,
Treasurer Brack Container Corporation.

ADMINISTRATION OF N. R. A.—30-HOUR WEEK

Mr. WAGNER presented a telegram from Endicott Johnson Corporation, Endicott, N. Y., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENDICOTT, N. Y., *March 23, 1935.*

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Senate Office Building:

We believe our New York Senators and Congressmen in Washington would like to know our position in respect to two vital questions now under consideration. We favor and strongly urge continuance of N. R. A. for another 2-year period, as advocated by the President. Discontinuance of all the good things that have resulted through N. R. A., meaning maximum hours, minimum wages, and abolishment of child labor, and failure to enact Federal legislation to further protect these important things would be a serious mistake that would do more harm through increasing unemployment and lowering wages to workers and further retarding recovery than anything that could possibly happen at this time. We are not in favor of and vigorously protest against the enactment of any bill that would arbitrarily set the hours of labor, as the Black bill in the Senate and the Connery bill in the House provides. Hours of work for industries should be planned through N. R. A. by industries themselves. The effect of a uniform work week of 30 hours would greatly increase prices, reduce standards of living, increase unemployment, and retard recovery.

ENDICOTT JOHNSON CORPORATION,
GEORGE F. JOHNSON, *Chairman.*
GEORGE W. JOHNSON, *President.*
CHAS. F. JOHNSON, Jr.,
Vice President and General Manager.

ENVELOP INDUSTRY CODE

Mr. FLETCHER. I present a communication from the Envelope Manufacturers' Association of America and ask that the first page be printed in the RECORD and that the entire communication be referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Finance, and the first page was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENVELOPE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY FOR CODE
AUTHORITY, ENVELOP INDUSTRY,
New York City, March 23, 1935.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Washington, D. C.

FACTS PROVE N. R. A. HELPS SMALL BUSINESS

DEAR SIR: Do codes hurt small business?

Not in the envelop manufacturing industry, where small businesses are 90 percent of the companies.

Attached figures show how under the envelop industry code:

	Percent
Big companies' volume dropped	7
Small companies' volume gained	8
Very small companies' volume gained	20

If N. I. R. A. is not extended with provisions to restrain unfair competition, the small businesses in the envelop industry will lose their gains.

A second sheet of figures is attached showing how this industry of small enterprises has increased wages 28 percent, and the number of its employees 16 percent.

If Congress allows ruthless competition to come back, envelop manufacturers will find it hard to take care of their 9,000 employees.

Very truly yours,

ROLAND R. BLISS,
Executive Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on Commerce, submitted a report (No. 361) to accompany the bill (S. 5) to prevent the manufacture, shipment, and sale of adulterated or misbranded food, drink, drugs, and cosmetics and to regulate traffic therein, to prevent the false advertisement of food, drink, drugs, and cosmetics, and for other purposes, heretofore reported by him.

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 395) relative to the qualifications of practitioners of law in the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 372) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2333) for the relief of John W. Dady, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 371) thereon.

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3071) for the relief of Second Lt. Charles E. Upson, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 368) thereon.

Mr. DICKINSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2117) for the relief of Cora A. Snyder, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 369) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1575) to correct the military record of John S. Cannell, deceased, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 370) thereon.

Mr. DUFFY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 983) for the relief of Grady D. Coleman, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 373) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 2367) to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present forms of farm tenancy, to engage in rural rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GIBSON:

A bill (S. 2368) to promote safety of life and property at sea and to aid in preventing marine disasters; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ASHURST (by request):

A bill (S. 2369) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the repatriation of certain insane American citizens", approved March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1495); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 2370) for the relief of Okaloosa County, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2371) for the relief of Margaret G. Baldwin; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2372) for the relief of Chase, Leavitt & Co. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEIWER:

A bill (S. 2373) for the relief of Harry Jarrette; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 2374) for the relief of Elliott H. Tasso and Emma Tasso; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2375) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2376) granting a pension to Effie Welsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 2377) for the relief of W. J. DuRant; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2378) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States a bequest of certain personal property of the late Dr. Malcolm Storer, of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2379) making it unlawful to use the mails to solicit or effect insurance or collect insurance premiums in any State without complying with the insurance laws thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

A bill (S. 2380) for the relief of Wilbur N. Fisher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 2381) for the relief of Harry V. Snyder; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2382) granting a pension to Ella Beagle; and

A bill (S. 2383) granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. Haynes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2384) to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of conservation education in the public elementary schools, high schools, colleges, and universities; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers, supervisors, and directors of conservation subjects on the natural resources; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 2385) granting a pension to Alice E. Pillsbury; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MALONEY:

A bill (S. 2386) granting a pension to Helen M. Crowley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 2387) for the relief of Jonathan L. Whitney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2388) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel patent in fee issued to Victoria Arconge; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 2389) granting a pension to Martha Ross (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2390) granting a pension to James T. Lanpher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 2391) to amend section 4 of the United States Grain Standards Act of 1916 as relating to the use of the official grain standards of the United States on grain moved in interstate commerce from shipping points to destination points without official grade determination; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bill 2392, which appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. HATCH introduced Senate bill 2393, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2394) to authorize the transfer of certain military reservations to other departments of the Government, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2395) to authorize exchange of lands at military reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (by request):

A bill (S. 2396) to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933, enacted to safeguard the interests and welfare of Indians of the Taos Pueblo, N. Mex., in certain lands within the Carson National Forest; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

A bill (S. 2397) authorizing the retirement of First Lt. Lucius L. Handly, Medical Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUTTING:

A bill (S. 2398) authorizing extensions of time on oil- and gas-prospecting permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 92) making final disposition of records, files, and other property of the Federal Aviation Commission; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 93) to extend the time within which contracts may be modified or canceled under the provisions of section 5 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934; to the Committee on Commerce.

FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, and although it involves an appropriation, nevertheless, because it deals with the subject of housing, I am going to ask that it be referred first to the Committee on Education and Labor. It involves a subject which that committee has studied and is still studying. After that committee shall have completed its consideration of the bill, I shall ask that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2392) to promote the public health, safety, and welfare by providing for the elimination of insanitary and dangerous housing conditions, to relieve congested areas, to aid in the construction and supervision of low-rental dwelling accommodations, and to further national industrial recovery through the employment of labor and materials, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

RELIEF OF WIDOW OF RAY SUTTON

Mr. HATCH. I introduce a bill for reference to the Committee on Claims. In connection with the bill I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief explanation of its purport.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2393) for the relief of the widow of Ray Sutton was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The statement of Mr. HATCH was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CARL A. HATCH IN CONNECTION WITH A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF THE WIDOW OF RAY SUTTON

Ray Sutton was one of the outstanding peace officers of the West. I was personally acquainted with him for many years. His reputation as a citizen, man, and officer was very high. When I say that he was faithful and loyal in the discharge of all duties, I speak from personal knowledge and acquaintance. Many times Mr. Sutton appeared as a witness in a court over which I presided. I frequently marked the honesty and straightforwardness with which he testified and how impressive he was in his testimony before the juries of the State, and especially before those juries with whom he had personal acquaintance.

He was noted for his courage and fearlessness. He rarely resorted to force in making arrests and in dealing with criminals. In fact, it was commonly known throughout the State that Ray Sutton rarely went armed. Perhaps his very courage and bravery caused him to be a victim of what I believe to be one of the foulest and most uncalled for murders ever perpetrated in my State.

For a number of years before 1930 Mr. Sutton had been employed in the prohibition forces of the United States Government. In that capacity he served his Government with loyalty and faithfulness. On August 28, 1930, while in the discharge of official duties, we in New Mexico believe he was waylaid and murdered by criminals whose arrest he was seeking. It has been frequently said in my State that Sutton was engaged in securing evidence against an alleged gang of criminals operating in Colorado and New Mexico. On the morning of August 28, Ray Sutton disappeared. His body has never been found, and no man knows with certainty what happened to Ray Sutton. After failing to receive Mr. Sutton's daily report for several days the Government began an investigation. The Government car which he had been using was found secreted in a lonely and distant canyon in the mountain area.

It was known that Agent Sutton had his current salary check on his person at the time of his disappearance. Later this check was cashed at Trinidad, Colo., by a person who exhibited a Masonic ring and lodge card bearing Agent Sutton's name for identification purposes. This party was charged with forging the check, was tried, but was acquitted.

Many rumors are current as to how Sutton was murdered and his body so effectively disposed of, but prohibition officers, the United States attorney, and State officers all believe without question that Sutton was murdered and that his body was either buried or weighted and deposited in one of several lakes in the locality in which his car was found, or perhaps concealed in some abandoned, obsolete mines.

Sutton left surviving him a widow and two children. Ordinarily, under the Employees' Compensation Act and civil service retirement fund, his family would be entitled to compensation. But, due to absence of proof of the actual death of Sutton, it has been ruled that these benefits cannot be made payable to the widow until after the statutory period of 7 years has elapsed. The purpose of the bill I have introduced is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Mrs. Sutton the salary and expense-account checks which were made out to him before his disappearance, and also to make available immediately to the widow the benefits to which she would be entitled from the United States Employees' Compensation Commission and the civil service retirement fund. It goes without saying that Mrs. Sutton is in need of this money. The payment of Sutton's life insurance is also being held up until the expiration of the statutory period, I am informed.

I am told the Department of Justice concurs in my view that these payments should be made now and Mrs. Sutton should not be compelled to wait 7 years before payment is made. It may be added that the Government has spared no expense in seeking to solve the mystery which surrounds the death of Ray Sutton. The Department knows he was above the average as an enforcement officer. We in New Mexico are more than convinced, as I have said, that he was murdered in a most foul manner. We think the benefits payable to the widow should be made now, and it is not quite fair to ask her to wait the full 7 years before the payments can be made. Our chief hope is that the Government will continue its efforts to bring the guilty ones to justice, and we have faith that some day the mystery surrounding the death of Ray Sutton will be solved and his murderers will pay the penalty which they so richly deserve.

It is a pleasure for me to introduce this bill and make this statement concerning a man whom I knew to be honest, loyal, faithful, and true to every obligation of citizen and official, and who was my friend.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McGILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6718, the Agricultural Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

After the figures 1906, in line 22 on page 4 of the bill, strike out the comma and insert a period, and strike from the bill on page 4 thereof lines 23 and 24.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6223, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 11, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following new paragraph:

"The act entitled 'An act to fix the compensation of registers of local land offices, and for other purposes', approved May 21, 1928, is amended by striking out '$1,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,000.'"

AMENDMENT TO 30-HOUR WEEK BILL

Mr. BORAH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 87) to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of certain articles and commodities, in connection with which persons are employed more than 5 days per week or 6 hours per day, and prescribing certain conditions with respect to purchases and loans by the United States, and codes, agreements, and licenses under the National Industrial Recovery Act, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPEAL OF PUBLICITY SECTION OF REVENUE ACT OF 1934—AMENDMENT

Mr. COSTIGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6359) to repeal certain provisions relating to publicity of certain statements of income, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on March 4, 1935, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] joined in the introduction of the bill (S. 2149) to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes. At that time the bill was properly referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. In the meantime the Soil Erosion Service has been transferred to the Department of Agriculture, and I now ask that the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6511) to amend the air mail laws and to authorize the extension of the Air Mail Service was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

OPERATION OF N. R. A. CODES

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, two letters received by me with reference to the operation of codes under the N. R. A., and particularly I want to call attention to a letter from Mr. Vail, whom I knew for many years as a manufacturer of refrigerators in my home city.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSEHOLD ICE REFRIGERATOR INDUSTRY,
Chicago, March 20, 1935.

Hon. RYAN DUFFY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DUFFY: The investigation being conducted by the Senate Judiciary Committee on N. R. A. is attracting wide attention, and due to some very unfavorable reports, which have been issued by the hostile press, I think it fitting that some statement should be included in the record from the side of industry.

I was engaged in the manufacture of refrigerators for upward of 20 years and have, since the signing of the Code of the Household Ice Refrigerator Industry, served as the administrative officer for the industry and have had opportunity to observe the workings of the code and results, which I shall later refer to.

During the years 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933 conditions in the refrigerator industry were gradually growing worse. In the wild scramble for business and in the endeavor to keep factories working at least part time, prices, terms, and sound business methods were completely demoralized, with the result that there was no price on the commodity referred to, so that most of the factories lost money steadily and several were obliged to close their doors. In a situation such as this the manufacturer naturally looks for ways to reduce his costs and usually the first thing he hits upon is the reduction of labor rates.

In the industry to which I refer, previous to 1929 the average working hours were 60 hours a week and the wages ranged anywhere from 17 to 28 cents per hour. When Congress saw fit to pass the National Recovery Act, industry experienced some encouragement, and in writing the code, which was later approved by the President, they consented to shorter hours, the abolition of child labor, and a minimum wage of 35 cents an hour. They also wrote into the code specific terms and other sound trade practices.

A year's operation under this code shows that the encouragement was well founded, and the provisions of the code have been complied with by at least 95 percent of the members of the industry. On the profit side, the manufacturers have shown a substantial increase in their unit sales and an actual increase in employment of 50 percent in numbers.

The administration of the code has not worked a hardship on any member, the rate of assessment being set at 1 mill on the dollar on gross sales. There may have been racketeering in some industries but such is not the case in this one. The contributions have been entirely on a voluntary basis and no member has expressed any dissatisfaction on this score, as complete reports of production, sales, wages, etc., are furnished them monthly.

Several amendments have been made to the code and as it stands today it represents the wishes of the industry.

There has been much loose talk through the newspapers and elsewhere of cases like the battery manufacturer in Erie, Pa., who claims that he cannot afford to pay more than 25 cents an hour to his help. My answer to such individuals would be that they have no business to be engaged in manufacture, as labor cannot exist on such wages.

So far as this industry is concerned, it believes in paying a fair wage and in conducting business upon sound principles, and the members of the industry attribute their improved conditions to the operation of N. R. A.

We have heard some propaganda suggesting that the National Industrial Recovery Act be allowed to lapse on June 16, but my contact with members of not only this industry but many other industries from coast to coast leads me to the statement that if N. R. A. folds up on June 16 we will witness the worst price war that we have ever had, a slashing of wages, and general chaos in the labor market. If an attempt is made to continue the N. R. A. embodying only the hour and wage provisions, it would be another law impossible of enforcement. So long as industry is allowed to retain the trade practices it will observe the hour and wage provisions of the codes, but not otherwise.

Naturally, in the enforcing of a law of such far-reaching effect there will be some impositions and some mistakes made, but if the senatorial committee having this matter in charge will summon before them men who have had opportunity to observe the actual workings of these codes, who are not prejudiced by politics or otherwise, they will find a sentiment for the continuance of the law practically in its present form for at least another 2 years.

Yours very truly,

E. G. VAIL.

CRUCIBLE STEEL CASTING CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 19, 1935.

Senator F. RYAN DUFFY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: For 5 years we have battled red figures but from the time that the Steel Casting Industry Code was adopted our tonnage increased from 100 to 300 percent, and we have slowly and moderately come back into black figures.

Our men are happier and our hopes are revived in the belief that we can continue in business now for future years. We are a small enterprise and employ not over 250 men. We cannot state emphatically enough that the N. R. A. is the only arrangement that has done this thing for us.

We hope that your minds will not be affected by the small minority of chiselers and newspapers who are not telling the truth. The open-price plan in our particular code is a wonderful thing for our industry and should be kept up by all means.

Yours very truly,

CRUCIBLE STEEL CASTING CO.,
W. W. LANGE, *Vice President.*

IMPORTATIONS OF GRAIN ON EASTERN SEABOARD

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter from a constituent of mine in Indiana, together with a reply to the letter addressed to me and signed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The correspondence relates to what are stated to be heavy importations of grain into the United States, and, as bearing on this subject, it seems to me that the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture is very illuminating.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA FARMERS MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 28, 1935.

Senator FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: While I have never met you personally, yet I feel that I am acquainted with you because of your public activity and the things you have done. The burden of my letter is to secure some positive information touching a certain matter in connection with agriculture. It is this:

A friend of mine who has a lifetime of experience in the grain business as a manufacturer has a son who is connected with the purchase and selling of grain and has a lot of contact with boards of trade in Indianapolis, Chicago, and elsewhere. From this point of contact I am told that no grain—that is, corn, oats, or wheat—is being sold east of Ohio's eastern State line; that the grain being supplied in the district between there and the Atlantic, which would take in all of the New England States, is imported from France and Argentina. Further, that because of this, ere many months, corn will drop back to near 50 cents per bushel, although it is commanding a rather attractive price at this time.

I would like to have your comment on this situation if such exists, or, in other words, I would like to know if it does exist. My contention has always been, Senator, that if we had the American market for the American producer we would not suffer so greatly because of not having a foreign market. Further, the question arises in my mind, Why have the hog-corn control for the Corn Belt of this country and then permit a good portion of the United States markets to go to foreign trade? If this market was had by the American farmer in the great corn and wheat producing area, it surely would help a lot toward a good price. This surely could be maintained for the American farmer by a good tariff.

Pardon me for my discussion if it seems lengthy, and I hope you will not think I have transgressed in writing you. I would like to have your comment for the reason that, while I am interested in

insurance and am connected with the second largest mutual insurance company in the United States writing like coverage, I am also interested in agriculture, having a good farm consisting of 275 acres. This is good land for any one of the grain crops. Diversified farming is followed on this farm at the present time.

Assuring you that I shall appreciate a reply, I beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

ARTEMUS H. MYERS, *President.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1935.

Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR VAN NUYS: In reply to your letter of February 8, 1935, transmitting an inquiry from Mr. Artemus H. Myers, president of the Indiana Farmers Mutual Insurance Co. of Indianapolis, Ind., I take pleasure in giving you a statement regarding the policies of the Department of Agriculture in respect to the production and importation of grains.

Mr. Myers states that he has heard indirectly that because of the excessive restriction of production, no domestic grain (corn, wheat, or oats) is now being sold in the Atlantic Coast States, all being supplied from France and Argentina, and that because of this importation, corn will soon decline to about 50 cents per bushel. He asks whether this is true, and states that if it is correct the restriction and tariff policies need modification. He desires higher tariffs so that the domestic market may be reserved for the American producer.

In common with many others, Mr. Myers is apparently under the impression that the Department of Agriculture has restricted the production of all grains, and that decreases in the supply must be ascribed mainly to such action. Wheat and corn are the only grain products under restriction, and heavy declines in production of oats, barley, and rye are due solely to drought. Inasmuch as the Department of Agriculture has had nothing to do with control of these latter grains, no discussion of their movement will be given, and attention will be confined to corn and wheat alone.

The United States imported 2,959,256 bushels of corn during the calendar year 1934, but it exported 2,987,419 bushels. This country is therefore not on an import basis. Both import and export were insignificant in comparison with the domestic production which was 1,380,718,000 bushels during the year. Expressed as a ratio, there was 1 bushel of corn imported for every 450 bushels raised domestically. The rumors regarding the volume of corn imports, or their effect in closing the markets in the Atlantic States, are therefore not to be taken seriously.

The potential effect of Argentine corn on domestic grain prices is also much exaggerated. There would appear to be little or no possibility that quotations for our corn will be forced to the 50-cent market, as can be seen from the following calculations:

Buenos Aires future price (Feb. 26) for corn:	*Per bushel*
For March delivery	$0.40⅞
For May delivery	.39⅜
Average	.40
Ocean freight (approximately)	.10
United States tariff duty	.25
Cost at New York, minus profit	.75

Thus the corn could not be sold in our Atlantic ports for local consumption at anything less than, say, 80 cents per bushel, and to reach interior markets would have to pay rail freight in addition.

The following table regarding corn production and prices may be of interest in connection with the discussion of restriction policies:

Year	Acreage harvested	Production		Farm value per bushel	Total
		Per acre	Total		
1932	108,668,000	26.8	2,906,873,000	$0.192	$558,902,000
1933	103,260,000	22.8	2,351,658,000	.393	924,930,000
1934	87,486,000	15.8	1,380,718,000	.786	1,085,565,000

It will be noted that the production during 1934 was somewhat less than half the 1932 figure, but that the price increased from 19.2 cents per bushel to 78.6 cents, and the farm value of the corn crop almost doubled. The decline in yield per acre was, of course, due to drought, and one-fourth of the reduction in harvested acreage was due to abandonment because of unfavorable weather. The reduction in production had a strong effect in increasing the price; but a large part of the price increase was due to vigorous Government action in 1933 and 1934, especially the corn-loan program.

The extent to which the low corn supplies were due to the drought, and the extent to which they were due to the adjustment program is indicated by the following comparison:

If there had been no acreage reduction in 1934, and an average yield per acre had been harvested (27.2 bushels), the crop would have been 2,800,000,000 bushels.

If acreage had been reduced only as much as required by corn-hog contracts, and an average yield per acre had been harvested, the crop would have been about 2,450,000,000 bushels.

With part of the planted acreage abandoned and yield per acre on the remainder cut down to 58 percent of normal, the crop was actually 1,381,000,000 bushels. The actual crop was about 1,420,000,000 bushels short of an average crop on an unreduced acreage. Of this shortage, 350,000,000 bushels (one-quarter) was due to the reduction program and 1,070,000,000 bushels (or three-quarters), was due to the acreage abandonment and low yields resulting from the 1934 drought.

As regards wheat, it is to be noted that imports amounted to 18,542,395 bushels in 1934, while exports were 16,968,589 bushels, and if we include the wheat equivalent of flour exports, approximately double this figure. Only 9,000 bushels of the imported wheat came from countries other than Canada. The imports were not extraordinarily large, having been exceeded in both 1928 and 1930, among recent years. Imports commonly average about 12,000,000 bushels, but almost none of this is imported for consumption, the great bulk of the tonnage arriving for milling in bond and subsequent exportation.

In addition to this more or less fixed "in bond" tonnage, there have also been, in 1934, considerable imports of "wheat unfit for human consumption", brought in for animal feed because of the drought; of durum, brought in because of the virtual failure of the crop of this special macaroni wheat; and of wheat for seed purposes. The drought so damaged the durum and other spring wheats that it was deemed advisable to bring in seed better capable of germinating than the stunted kernels of the domestic crop. Domestic supplies of wheat for bread-flour purposes have been adequate. The duty of 42 cents per bushel practically bars all imports for general consumption, aside from the durum attracted in over the tariff wall by reason of the acute shortage of the domestic crop.

The following tables show American wheat production and prices during the last three seasons. The effect of the drought in reducing the durum and other spring wheat production is very evident:

Domestic production

Year	Acreage harvested	Production		Value	
		Per acre	Total	Price per bushel	Total
		Bushels			
1932	57,114,000	13.1	745,788,000	$0.320	$238,828,000
1933	47,910,000	11.1	528,975,000	.679	359,048,000
1934	42,235,000	11.8	496,469,000	.871	432,441,000

The yields of the principal kinds of wheat for the 3 years are summarized below:

Year	Winter wheat	Durum wheat	Other spring wheat
1932	478,291,000	40,600,000	226,897,000
1933	350,792,000	16,737,000	161,446,000
1934	405,034,000	7,086,000	84,349,000

The same comments apply to wheat as were made in the case of corn. A smaller crop has reduced the tremendous carry-over without causing a loss of domestic markets and has at the same time almost doubled the farm value of the crop.

As regards the general matter of high agricultural tariffs and reservation of the domestic market, the Department believes that this policy can easily be carried to excess. We cannot export unless we import, and millions of our farmers are dependent on such export crops as cotton, tobacco, fruits, flour, and lard. It is impossible for this country to be self-contained in agricultural products, for certain commodities cannot be grown here, while on the other hand we have natural advantages in the production of other crops and can exchange these for the products we lack. It is impracticable, for example, to forego cotton exports, cut the acreage in half, and devote the land to some crop which we do not import, say, tea or silk. These commodities require large amounts of labor, and if produced in this country would have to sell for several times the present figure to make production remunerative. The market would be restricted by the price and few could afford their purchase. It is far easier to exchange cotton for silk, and in such cases the fewer tariff barriers, the better. The way to prosperity for our farmers does not lie through further restriction on our foreign trade. On the contrary their interest—and this applies particularly to the farmers of your own State—is on the side of restoration of foreign markets for our surplus farm products.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

IMPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to present for the RECORD certain significant import data; and then to submit a Senate resolution asking for information which it seems to me has become highly pertinent to an understanding of the economic hazard which continues to confront American agriculture.

Secretary of State Hull declared, on March 24, that we are confronting a crisis in our foreign trade, and suggested a continuation of further imports of farm and other products, and a general continuing lowering of tariff restrictions upon foreign imports. This raises a basic consideration which calls for solid facts.

Mr. President, the point I desire to emphasize at the moment is that there already is apparently an alarming increase in our farm imports. At the very moment when we are undertaking to support domestic agriculture in a substantial way by large subsidies from the Public Treasury we are supporting foreign agriculture with a constantly increasing share of the American market. That utterly paradoxical situation is confronting us. It must promptly be corrected if we are to hope for any ultimate net advantage to American agriculture or to the Republic. The latter cannot be saved until the former is adequately served.

I desire to point out, for example, that Mr. Paul Mallon reports in the Evening Star of tonight, as follows:

> Foreign farm importations have been running about twice as large as last year. The March figures to be published soon will show two and one-half to three times as much as March last year.

Then he continues:

> If you dig into the last official figures, you will find that the quantity of farm imports in February last year was about 15,000,000 units and this year 37,000,000. The value jumped from $3,000,000 to $10,000,000.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> To afford an idea of which farm imports are increasing and how much, the following official round figures for February may be cited, showing increases over the same month of the previous year:
>
> Butter, 3,000,000 pounds, or 5 times as much as in February 1934; live cattle, 38,000 head, 6 times as much; pork, 168,000 pounds, or 34 times as much; canned meats, 4,000,000 pounds, 3 times as much; corn, 1,800,000 bushels, or 121 times as much; wheat, 1,000,000 bushels, 28 times as much.

Mr. President, can you escape the challenge in these telltale mathematics? Can Senators indefinitely ignore these suicidal trends? Are they, or are they not, a correct reflection of the new menace to domestic agriculture and the new checkmate to domestic farm relief?

I desire also to read into the RECORD a brief paragraph from the Buenos Aires Herald indicating the viewpoint upon this problem in South America:

> There is now little or no beef export trade from the United States and the existing cattle numbers are said to be from five to ten millions in excess of requirements unless the internal consumption of beef can be stimulated or the export trade revived. To add to the embarrassment of producers, thousands of cattle are imported annually from Mexico and Canada. Canned meats are imported from South America. Hides, skins, fats, and oils are imported in large quantities also.

I pause to note again that these are imports of agricultural commodities at a moment when we are attempting by Federal subsidy to support our own agriculture in the same fields. Why subsidize domestic agriculture and then defeat the advantage by permitting a large share of it, in effect, to go to alien agriculture?

I now desire to present a few more significant exhibits from South American sources, because they bear so definitely upon the problem which I am briefly discussing by way of introduction to a resolution asking for information.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DICKINSON. In addition to the commodities which the Senator from Michigan has already mentioned, I find, according to the report of James E. Bennett & Co., a large commission concern in Chicago, that over 1,500,000 pounds of New Zealand butter are scheduled to arrive in New York next week, and that the market shows strong indications of going still lower. I also find that live cattle have been introduced; and, according to a report from Chicago dated March 4, the week's receipts include 20 cars of Canadian cattle, which sold largely at 9½ to 10.75. Another, dated March 2, says that "yesterday's receipts of cattle were 2,500 head, including five cars of Canadian cattle."

That is a little addition to what the Senator has already read from the former report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from Iowa for the exhibit. It reiterates the proposition which I shall presently lay before the Senate in the form of a resolution asking for information.

I am proceeding on the theory that it is absolutely impossible for us intelligently to formulate either an intelligent foreign-trade policy such as the State Department and the President are now presumed to be pursuing, or an effective protective policy for our own domestic agriculture, except as we have a complete mobilization of the facts involved in these contemplations, and then face the realities and fit our policies to the realities, instead of trying to wish our way through the situation. We confront a condition, not a theory.

I desire to refer to one more exhibit before submitting the resolution.

I have before me excerpts from the trade journal named "The Review of the River Plate", published December 28, 1934, in South America. I read just a few high lights from these reports. They tell the story of what is apparently happening to American agriculture, thanks to contemporary policy. They suggest, it seems to me, that American agriculture needs more rather than less protection.

From Uruguayan ports, for example, shipments were made to Los Angeles of 9,612 cases of canned meat.

Shipments were made to San Francisco of 24,900 cases of canned meat.

This was in November and December 1934.

Shipments were made to Jacksonville of 16,420 cases of canned meat.

Shipments were made to Norfolk of 14,750 cases of canned meat.

Shipments were made to New York of 1,090 casks of tallow.

Shipments were made again to Los Angeles of 14,238 cases of canned meat.

Without burdening the Senate with the detail, I simply add a few more of the high spots.

Shipments were made to Jacksonville of 1,062 tierces of tallow. A tierce is a cask about the size of one of our gasoline barrels.

Shipments were made to Norfolk of 1,062 casks of tallow.

Shipments were made to New York of 286 cases of asparagus.

Shipments were made to New Orleans of 406 tons of oats.

Shipments were made to Houston of 305 tons of oats.

Shipments were made to Baltimore of 25 tons of maize.

Shipments were made to New Orleans of 508 tons of maize.

Shipments were made to New York of 4,420 tons of linseed.

These reports from South American sources are very complete, and they are equally significant.

I ask that the complete memorandum may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my observations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorandum is as follows:

> The following are excerpts from the trade journal named "The Review of the River Plate", published December 28, 1934, which show various shipments of agricultural products from South American ports to United States ports in November and December 1934:
>
> From Uruguayan ports—
>
> To New Orleans, 2,000 cases canned meat.
>
> To Los Angeles, 9,612 cases canned meat; San Francisco, 24,900 cases canned meat; Portland, 3,484 cases canned meat; Seattle, 7,520 cases canned meat.
>
> To New York, 725 cases canned meat, 285 tierces tallow, 137 tierces stearine, 40 tierces salted tripes.
>
> To New York, 202 bales wool; Philadelphia, 2,550 cases canned meat, 426 tons bones.
>
> To New Orleans, 3,080 cases canned meat.
>
> To Jacksonville, 16,420 cases canned meat; Norfolk, 14,750 cases canned meat; Baltimore, 5,750 cases canned meat.
>
> To New York, 830 cases canned meat, 5 bales wild-animal skins, 8 bales pigskins, 1,090 casks tallow, 11 tierces tripes, 40 empty cylinders, 2 cases various.
>
> To Boston, 750 cases canned meat; New York, 25 cases petit grain essence; Philadelphia, 1,000 cases canned meat, 785 tons bones.
>
> To New York, 462 cases canned meat, 208 bales jerked beef, 312 cases beef extract, 25 bales wild-boar skins, 24 tierces salted tripes, 7 crates various.
>
> To Los Angeles, 14,238 cases canned meat; San Francisco, 600 cases canned meat; San Francisco, option, 3,040 cases canned meat; Portland, 250 cases canned meat; Tacoma, 500 cases canned meat; Seattle, 250 cases canned meat.

To New York, 1,280 cases canned meat, 26 bales tanned hides, 375 bales jerked beef, 1 tierce pickled skins, 3 tierces salted tripes, 19 cases electrical materials.

From Argentinian ports—

To Jacksonville, 12,600 cases canned meat, 46 tons guano, 117 tons quebracho extract, 1,062 tierces tallow, 50 tons dried blood. Miami, 2,250 cases canned meat. Norfolk, 30 tons bones, 114 tons dried blood, 29,868 salted ox hides, 625 tons quebracho extract, 15,250 cases canned meat, 1,062 casks tallow. Norfolk-Newport News, 603 tons quebracho extract. Baltimore, 133 tierces tallow, 5,000 cases canned meat, 25 tons birdseed, 1,718 tons quebracho extract, 457 tons bones, 23 tons stearine, 286 casks tallow.

To New Orleans, 850 cases canned meat, 280 tierces tallow, 542 barrels tallow, 209 barrels stearine, 2 crates various. Mobile, 750 cases canned meat. Pensacola, 525 cases canned meat. Tampa, 500 cases canned meat.

To Los Angeles-San Francisco, 86 tons birdseed. San Francisco, 10 cylinders yerba, 1,500 cases canned meat, 25 tons birdseed, 10 tons quebracho extract, 359 salted ox hides. Oakland, 100 cases canned meat. Portland, 500 cases canned meat. Seattle, 23 tons bone powder, 100 tons guano. Tacoma, 270 cases canned meat. Honolulu, 1,000 cases canned meat, 25 cases hams.

To New York, 286 cases asparagus, 50 cases cheese, 541 cases melons, 5,000 cases canned meat, 151 tons cottonseed, 20 tons birdseed, 102 tons bran, 20 tons liver powder, 4 cases and 19 bales wild animal skins, 10 bales tobacco sticks, 138 bales sheepskins, 48 bales goatskins, 160 bales wool, 95 bales guinea straw, 42 bales cotton rags, 10 bales wild-boar skins, 10 casks bladders, 15 casks salted tripes, 13 tierces salted tripes, 3 cases dried tripes, 105 bags yerba mate, 4 cases steel cylinders, 243 casks tallow, 80 block onyx, 2 tierces gall, 3 cases motors, 4 cases various. In transit to Philadelphia, 29 bales goatskins.

To New Orleans, 406 tons oats. Houston, 305 tons oats.

To Baltimore, 25 tons maize.

To New Orleans, 508 tons maize. New Orleans-Mobile, 508 tons oats.

To New York, 4,420 tons linseed; 1,556 tons linseed; 50 tons maize; 1,340 tons linseed.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BARBOUR. It seems to me that very often we think only of the farmer in respect to this whole problem. I ask the Senator whether he has had any investigation made, or whether he has any figures in relation to the fishing industry. I am sure he will find a terrible situation in that industry, particularly on the Pacific coast, where the Japanese are now supplying increasingly the fish, both canned fish and fresh fish, which heretofore were caught by American citizens. I hope the Senator will include in the request he is trying to get through that field of activity, which in its way is quite as important as the agricultural activity the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know that the situation to which the able Senator from New Jersey refers exists, and I freely concede that the information is essential in connection with the general situation. This is a problem in all branches of agriculture and industry. But the particular resolution which I am now submitting and asking to have considered deals specifically with the agricultural problem, because it is the agricultural problem, fundamentally, which is the primary American problem at the moment. It is the agricultural problem in which we find ourselves upon the one hand paying vast sums from the Public Treasury, or vast sums by way of processing taxes to sustain it, while, on the other hand, apparently, we are constantly being infiltrated with increasing agricultural imports which serve either to dilute or ultimately to nullify the domestic policies which we are undertaking to pursue in behalf of agriculture.

Furthermore, this inquiry bears specifically upon the proposition that the Department of State and the President are engaged in the negotiation of so-called "tariff bargains" at the moment, and in every one of these tariff bargains sooner or later some agricultural product shows up as having been traded away, so far as the rights of the American farmer are concerned, in behalf of some foreign farmer in return for some theoretical advantage to some other domestic interest.

I am not attempting to argue the matter; I am asking only that the Senate request the departments of the Government where the essential information may be obtained to submit to the Senate complete studies from which it may be dependably deducted what our problem is and what the answer ought to be and whether we are on the right track.

Let us know the facts, Mr. President. Let us face the truth. Let us deal with realities. We cannot indefinitely survive upon the basis of synthetic optimism. Is it true or is it not true that at the very moment when the Department of Agriculture is making new subsidies to the American farmer in an effort to save him from extinction the Department of State is making new tariff concessions to alien agriculture which are helping drive this American farmer ever nearer to extinction? Is it true or is it not true that foreign agricultural commodities are flowing over our tariff wall in an increasing flood, regardless of these other reciprocal manipulations, which helps to drown the same American farmer whom the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is attempting to save? Is it true or is it not true that the distinguished Secretary of State cannot possibly create substantial renewal of exports in such staple crops as wheat and cotton because of the fact that our erstwhile world customers are now amply producing their own wheat and cotton? Is it true or is it not true, therefore, that the administration program is a broken reed? What are the facts? The departments have the facts. Let the facts come to Congress and the country. Then we can make intelligent decisions. I have but reported straws in the wind. Let us confront the whole authentic reality. To be sure, we have not much congressional tariff power left since we surrendered our primary authority to the President and turned protected agriculture and protected industry over to the mercies of administrators who are desperately in love with their own low-tariff ideals. But the process of mobilizing facts may prove salutary exercise for these earnest and highly respected administrators themselves and Congress, in turn, may return to its senses. Or, if all my conjectures err, the result will be a triumph for the new idea which I so fear and to which I address this scrutiny.

I am submitting the resolution which I send to the desk, and which I ask that the clerk read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 111), as follows:

Whereas it is publicly recorded that within the last 12 months there has been an influx into the United States of a large volume of agricultural products, of a kind and nature produced in the United States, which are displacing markets of our American farmers in meats, grains, and other items; and

Whereas Secretary of State Hull, in a public address on March 24, 1935, stated that we are confronting a crisis in our foreign trade, and suggests a continuation of further importation of farm products and a general lowering of our tariff restrictions; and

Whereas this country has been paying out of public funds millions of dollars to compensate farmers and stock raisers for limiting crops and reducing and destroying stock, with the object of eliminating national surpluses and thereby raising the price of the products of American farmers and stock raisers; and

Whereas the unhampered importation of competing agricultural products cannot do otherwise than injure the farmers and stock raisers by increasing our surpluses and using up our American markets, which traditionally belong to American farmers by natural law; and

Whereas it is of vital public interest, especially to Congress, that the status of the alleged imports be made known: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested to transmit to the Senate full and detailed information regarding the imports of agricultural products into the United States from January 1, 1934, to March 1, 1935, by countries of origin, dates of importation, the kinds, volume, and value in dollars of such imports, the names of the transporting ships, and the United States ports of entry; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretaries of Commerce and Agriculture and Special Foreign Trade Adviser Hon. George N. Peek be requested to transmit to the Senate any information available in their departments covering the calendar or fiscal years from 1904 to December 31, 1934, showing the cotton acreage, annual production and consumption, and annual import and export, in volume and dollar value of the cotton produced and consumed by the separate countries of the world, together with the annual world surplus; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretaries of Commerce and Agriculture and Special Foreign Trade Adviser Hon. George N. Peek be requested to transmit to the Senate any information available in their Departments covering the calendar and/or fiscal years from 1904 to December 31, 1934, showing the wheat acreage, annual production and consumption, and annual import and/or export, and volume and dollar value of the wheat produced and consumed by the separate countries of the world, together with the annual world surplus.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator is not asking for immediate consideration of the resolution, is he?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The resolution is simply a request for information, and I am asking for present consideration. I apprehend that no Senators fear facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall have to object. I ask that it go over.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then I ask that the resolution may go over under the rule, so that it may have action on our next calendar day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

WORLD NARCOTIC DEFENSE ASSOCIATION ADDRESSES

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the second and third of the series of Nation-wide broadcasts put on by the World Narcotic Defense Association in the interest of the enactment of the uniform State narcotic drug act now pending in a number of State legislatures. The second broadcast, consisting of an address by Mrs. Grace Morrison Poole, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and the third of an address by Mrs. Ida B. Wise Smith, national president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Second of a series of broadcasts in aid of narcotic legislation by States)

(Jan. 24, 1935)

WE BATTLE WITH A BEAST

(By Grace Morrison Poole, president of General Federation of Women's Clubs)

You are all, I am sure, familiar with that old legend of the 12 labors of Hercules, and possibly you remember that the second labor was the slaughter of the hydra, a water serpent that had nine heads of which the middle one was immortal. Every time Hercules struck off the heads with his club, in place of each two new heads appeared, and it was only after a long struggle, and with the assistance of his faithful nephew that he was able to accomplish his purpose. The problem you and I are discussing today is a beast with many, many heads, and the question of his final death is a many-sided one.

This afternoon we are dealing principally with the humanitarian angle of the narcotic evil and its devastating effects upon the human race, but in order that I may justify my own right to appear upon this most important program of broadcasts planned to arouse the public to the almost unbelievable effects of narcotics upon our Nation, may I remind my listeners that in 1923 the General Federation of Women's Clubs went on record with the passage of a resolution expressing realization of the evil effects resulting from the illicit peddling of drugs upon the youth of our Nation, even to children of school age, and the consequent undermining of the health and morals of the communities, and resolved to make plans for a vigorous campaign in cooperation with other agencies to wipe out this national evil.

In 1924 we went a step farther and addressed a resolution to the International Conference in Suppression of Opium and Limitation of the Manufacture of Drugs, in which we stated our belief that a major step in preventing the further spread of the drug-traffic evil would be the curtailment of production of narcotics.

In 1932 our organization addressed a resolution to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, in which we expressed the earnest hope that at the earliest practicable date the President and the Senate of the United States would proceed to the ratification of the convention coming out of the International Conference for the Limitation of the Manufacture of Narcotic Drugs, and would provide the necessary legislation by Congress for its effective enforcement.

At the same convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in 1932, realizing that the narcotic laws of many of the several States were lacking in uniformity and in greater or less degree failed to provide the basis for complete control of the illicit-drug traffic, we asked that the several States carefully examine their narcotic laws with a view to recommending such amendments as were found necessary to secure adequate statutory control and to achieve uniformity in the system of control to be provided.

We welcomed the action of the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association in approving, that same year, the principles for State legislation which had been worked out by the National Conference of Commissioners for Uniform State Legislation. We are indeed glad to work with these groups and with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics in putting the facts before our State federations and the women of the country. We are proud of the record made by Nevada, South Carolina, Virginia, Kentucky, New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Florida, and now Louisiana, in passing uniform legislation, and we believe that our club women have been largely instrumental in this work. In fact, Mr. Anslinger, who is heading the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, has written the South Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs, giving that body full credit for the passage of the law in that State. At our board of directors meeting here in Washington last week many of our State presidents took steps to plan for aiding passage of this important legislation in their own States. We hope we will have a part in aiding a large number of new States to place their names on the honor roll during 1935.

With this brief background which ties up the General Federation of Women's Clubs actively with the program of these various broadcasts, we would like to stress particularly this afternoon the humanitarian angle of the problem.

Only those of us who have been intimately connected with the insidious and awful effect of drug taking and drug using can fully appreciate what such a habit can do to an individual, who consciously or unconsciously comes under its influence.

When a person uses liquor it is done more or less in an open manner, and the results are apparent to every one who comes in contact with him, but the use of drugs is a very different matter. From the very beginning of the habit there develops a secrecy and cunning that are difficult to combat. For a long time unless persons know the symptoms, one may use a drug without its effects being very apparent, but during that period an iron grip has so taken hold of the drug user that before he or she realizes it, he faces a situation most difficult to overcome.

The users of drugs, as a general thing, have periods when they are normal, but the continued use of drugs leads eventually to the time when the user is a physical, mental, and moral wreck.

The users of drink, if they cannot obtain it, do not exhibit any very dangerous tendencies as a rule, but the confirmed users of drugs, if they cannot get them, will go to any length and any extreme to satisfy that abnormal appetite which has gripped them.

It is bad enough when the addict is an adult, but we have very good reason to know that at the present time in our colleges, and even in our high schools, drug peddlers are getting a lucrative living through selling a type of cigarette made from the marihuana (mar-i-wa-na) weed, which is known in the parlance of the peddlers as the "killer drug." It comes from a weed that grows in many of the States of the Union, and the student of narcotics tells us that the number of users of this particular drug is growing most rapidly in this country. The users, we are also told, are frequently turned into cruel monsters who commit the most atrocious crimes.

Now, the use of this drug is of fairly recent date, but because of its terrible reactions upon the human system we believe that there is even greater need than ever for the States to pass legislative measures for uniform control of narcotics.

Two big problems face us on the humanitarian side of this question which is linked up so closely with the necessity of legislative action. With those nations producing habit-making drug products working out a program of curtailment, the drugs will become more and more difficult to obtain; therefore, those who have already acquired the drug habit will become more and more desperate because of their inability to get that which they so ardently crave. That means that almost anything may happen in the case of the drug user. He will steal to get money to buy the drug, and in more than one instance we know, because of past tragedies, that he will not hesitate to commit murder to satisfy his appetite. Therefore, right along with the two remedial steps planned—to curtail production and manufacture and to enact State legislation that shall be uniform to control the traffic—there must be some definite plan worked out to help those who, because of conditions past and present, have been able fairly easily to get the drug.

There must be a more intelligent understanding among officers of the law in the differentiation of a man or woman fairly normal arrested for crime and the man or woman, either indirectly or directly, under the influence of a drug who has committed a crime. These in the second group are in dire need of intelligent medical treatment.

It is not easy to cure the drug habit, for it takes a person of strong will, in the last analysis, to gain a complete victory, and one of the saddest results of the drug habit is that it breaks down the strong human will and replaces it with a weak one, so in many, many instances, I am sorry to say, cures are only of temporary duration. But science has made progress along these lines and not simply must we demand legislative control measures but remedial legislative enactment as well. Hospitals and institutions equipped to deal patiently with those wrecks of humanity must have the support of our communities.

So much for those who have already formed the habits so detrimental to humanity. But there is much preventive work to do, and I am vitally concerned with this phase of the question. As I said in the earlier part of this talk, the amount of drug peddling in our schools and institutions where young people are found almost surpasses comprehension, and in these days of restlessness, disappointment, and disillusionment among our young people, one can hardly wonder that the temptation to forget all of life's troubles for a little while and dream pleasant dreams becomes too strong to be resisted.

You and I do not hesitate to put a great burden upon these young people of our Nation by saying that the mistakes we have made will be rectified by them; and we are really doing much to guarantee that they shall be the right type of young people by fighting the seen dangers that face them. But now I plead with

you, with all the eloquence I possess, to realize that the unseen danger which works so insidiously and relentlessly upon the character of our young people may be as vigorously attacked as those apparent to the naked eye.

(Third of a series of broadcasts in aid of narcotic legislation by States)

(Feb. 21, 1935)

NARCOTIC EDUCATION

(By Mrs. Ida B. Wise Smith, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union)

Last week was Boy Scout Week. The Nation's heart met appeals for community service in behalf of the boys who are the citizens of tomorrow and who in this time of stress and strain need safeguarding and direction as boys have never needed it before.

Following this, it is eminently fitting that the Nation's thought should be focused on a condition which menaces boys and girls and adults as well. The menace is particularly dreadful for youth, for all of life in all its years is likely to pay the price. Today is the beginning of narcotic-education week. For 9 years the World Narcotic Defense Association has rendered great service to humanity in exposing this fiendish business and in securing such world-wide interest that we are in the way to see a glimmer of hope in the sky, which not long ago did seem so dark. It is passing strange, is it not, that we need to be told more than once about the horror of drug addiction and the extent to which it grips people everywhere?

We greet you, Admiral Richmond Pearson Hobson, hero of the *Merrimac*, honored Member of Congress for many years, but now rendering possibly your best service to your country as president of the World Narcotic Defense Association. God speed your work and bless you in it.

Fifty-two nations of the world have ratified the narcotic convention, which limits the manufacture and distribution of narcotic drugs to the requirements of science and medicine; among these we stand second in our ratification.

But alas, this law, like many others, all others, is violated. Liquor was smuggled into the country, and now is between the States. Smuggling of drugs is easy because of the small space needed. For several years the worst victim nations of the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs were Egypt, the United States of America, and China. A few years ago, when I was in Egypt, those engaged in the traffic were also engaged in a strong effort to secure the removal of Russell Pasha, chief of police of Cairo, because he was reducing their contraband trade to a remarkable extent. His success has continued, but the United States and China still remain outstanding victims of this nefarious traffic.

Practically no drugs manufactured in the United States of America have entered the illicit traffic of either this or other countries. On the other hand, most of the illegally sold narcotics here were made elsewhere and smuggled in. The problem, therefore, is international whether considered from the national or from the international viewpoint.

In recent raids the chief drug seized was heroin, called the most deadly of narcotics. The main source of supply is the Far East and Bulgaria, and the "dope" seized was traced to French and Chinese ports of shipment. The morphine was found to come from Japan, China, and Honduras. In the last-named country alone, it is estimated, the morphine importations of the last 18 months would suffice for its legitimate needs for the next century, but most of this supply was intended for the contraband trade here. The cocaine was of Swiss, French, and British origin; smuggled in from Honduras, Mexico, and China, respectively.

A most alarming situation has developed in Bulgaria where at least 10 factories and laboratories producing illicit heroin, the worst of all narcotic drugs, have been located. Experts estimate that, during 1 year, enough heroin has been produced in Bulgaria to supply the total legitimate needs of the entire world for at least 4 years.

In the Far East, notably in China and Manchukuo, narcotic conditions have become so grave as to constitute a serious menace not only to China but also to the rest of the world. It is estimated that China produces annually 7 times as much as all the rest of the world together; also that 30 percent of the population of Manchuria are drug addicts. Not only is addiction to opium increasing, but the use of heroin and morphine appears to be ravishing the people of those countries. Evidence indicates that the clandestine manufacture of heroin and morphine is making rapid headway, and there is every reason to believe that quantities of those drugs are being smuggled into the United States and her colonies.

NARCOTIC CONDITIONS IN AMERICA

Why is the United States of America one of the outstanding drug victims of the world?

1. Because some nations do not effectively restrict their narcotic products to medical and scientific requirements, thus allowing large quantities to leak into the illicit traffic, whence they are smuggled into America.

2. Because many of our States neither have strong, uniform narcotic laws, nor efficient enforcement, and do not cooperate sufficiently with our Federal enforcement officers.

3. Because, with the exception of California and a few other States, the segregation and rehabilitation of drug addicts has been sadly neglected.

4. Because our youth in so many educational institutions have not been intelligently instructed concerning the narcotic problem.

5. Because among the public at large there has been a shameful ignorance and indifference toward the narcotic menace.

6. Because there is enormous wealth in the United States, and the illicit drug traffic has marked America as a most fertile field for its ignoble profits. In the illicit traffic many drugs sell for over 12 times as much as on legal medical prescription.

7. Because the boundaries of our Nation, extending over 10,000 miles, are so immense that our Federal Narcotics Bureau finds it difficult to prevent smuggling across such vast border areas.

8. Because of the highly organized criminal gangs and the great crime wave in the United States.

Listening friends, have you an adequate idea of just what this situation implies? Have you accurate knowledge of the dope menace to the life and health of the Nation?

"Dope User, 15, Tries to Kill", "Dope Peddled to High-School Students", "Paragoric, Marihuana, and Death Impulse", "Doped Cigarette Puts Hundreds in Drug Toils" have been some of the headlines greeting readers of daily papers during the Nation-wide drive of Federal authorities against the illicit drug traffic.

In Chicago the press has said: "Shocked by disclosures of dope being peddled to high-school students, police and school officials of Chicago yesterday launched a double-barreled drive against the traffic in habit-forming drugs. * * *

"Informed that peddlers of marihuana, held by crime fighters to be as vicious as narcotics or opiates, are making their headquarters near high schools, Superintendent of Schools Bogan ordered his district superintendents to launch an investigation and submit reports. Lt. William Cusack, head of the narcotic squad, revealed the marihuana weed is being grown domestically—plots of ground being devoted to it within a few miles of Chicago. * * * He has sent 197 peddlers of it to jail, deported 50 persons to Mexico for selling the weed, seized 167 pounds of marihuana and 183,000 cigarettes within the past year."

Marihuana is a derivative from a variety of hemp. In the desert section of the West where it is indigenous it is called "loco weed." It is rolled in cigarettes which sell from 25 cents to a dollar. It produces an effect similar to Turkish hashish. It creates delusions of grandeur and breaks down the will power and makes the addict ready for any crime, even murder. The last stage is a depression during which suicide is often contemplated or even accomplished.

One of the drug-habit tragedies reads in part:

"Investigation of the sale of drugs to school children in the M. school district was ordered last night after a boy of 15 had attacked his father, a music teacher, with a knife while crazed with marihuana cigarettes. Only the father's quick action in wresting the weapon from the youth saved the parent from death or serious injury. After hearing the boy's story the officers arrested the owner of the school store and the clerk from whom the boy said he bought the cigarettes."

Another account is that of a lad of 19 who "had been brought to the verge of suicide by drugs", and who led the narcotic squad in raiding an apartment:

"The young victim said he was driven to desperation by marihuana cigarettes he had smoked there, * * * and had tried to plunge into the river." Prevented by passersby, he was taken to the boys' court, where "he confessed he had spent many nights in the apartments where, he said, the drug was sold to boys and girls who were allowed to sleep off the effect. He had been a choir boy when he fell into the clutches of a paregoric peddler. * * * He grasped at the chance to take a 3 months' cure at the Bridewell."

Within a few days during a Nation-wide Federal drive last December more than 800 peddlers and narcotic denizens of the underworld were arrested. One of the peddlers confessed that he had been selling dope at the rate of $1,300,000 a year and that many women and girls came to his apartment for their daily dope jamboree. In many cities leaders of rings have been seized who were not content with supplying addicts with drugs, but plotted to ensnare large groups of new victims by giving boys and girls free samples.

It is estimated by Federal experts that 80 percent of drug addicts become criminals, for they will lie, steal, or commit any crime to get the money to satisfy their terrible appetite for drugs. A large portion of the inmates of Federal penitentiaries are either drug addicts or were convicted for violation of narcotic laws.

What can be done to aid in this crisis?

An important matter to which all citizens should give their attention is the passage of the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act by the State legislatures. The Federal Narcotic Bureau exercises control over manufacture, importations, and interstate traffic in drugs. But the Federal Government cannot revoke the State license of a physician or dentist or druggist who violates the law. He may be convicted and serve a Federal sentence and return to his practice in his State. The cooperation of the United States in the International conference is incomplete till all States have passed such a law. Only nine States have done so.

Will not every hearer today in the other States write to the Senator and Representative of his district and urge their interest in the enactment of the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act?

There must be narcotic hospitals for the segregation and rehabilitation of these unfortunate people, for their own sakes and for the protection of society.

Finally, youth and the public at large must be educated that they may not acquire the drug habit and they may all join in the struggle to free their own and other countries from the narcotic drugs, alcohol, opium, heroin, marihuana, and any others which destroy the body and mentality of the individual and thus lower the standard of our Nation.

THE BONUS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio speech delivered by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] on March 25 on the subject of the so-called "bonus."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am going to talk to you very earnestly about an important matter now pending before the American Congress. I refer to those bills which seek to pay off in one manner or another the soldiers' bonus certificates.

Now, what is a bonus certificate? Do you know how the amount of money shown on the face of each veteran's certificate was calculated? If you do not know, I shall first try to explain this, for unless you understand just how the amount due each veteran was arrived at, you cannot intelligently pass upon the several bills dealing with this subject. Let me explain. Congress passed the so-called "Bonus Act" in 1925. That act provided that every person who had served more than 60 days in the armed forces of the United States during the World War should receive for such service an additional pay, or bonus, at the rate of $1 per day for each day's service within the United States and $1.25 a day for each day's service outside the United States.

Due to the fact that this bonus law was passed in 1925, 7 years after the World War had closed, Congress added 25 percent to the amount found to be due each veteran.

Every veteran can count the number of days he served in our armed forces during the World War within the United States and under this law he gets an extra dollar for each one of those days; likewise, he can figure how many days he served outside of the United States, and he knows he gets $1.25 extra for each day of that foreign service. Now, if he will add 25 percent of the amount that he finds that is due him, he will know exactly what was coming to him in the year 1925.

Yet any man who had $500 coming to him in 1925 for such service has gotten an adjusted-service certificate for $1,250, or two and one-half times the amount of extra pay allowed for service under the Bonus Act. Why is this? Because the $500 was used in 1925 to buy for such a veteran a 20-year endowment life-insurance policy. This accounts for the fact that every bonus certificate issued by the United States Government to a war veteran contains an amount of money due the veteran in 1945, which is two and one-half times what his actual bonus pay would amount to as of 1925.

I hope the veterans will understand this, for if every veteran will take his bonus certificate and hold it in his hand, he will see that the amount of money due him in 1945 is about two and one-half times what would actually be coming to him on the basis of a dollar a day extra for service in this country and one dollar and a quarter a day extra for service abroad.

All endowment life-insurance policies increase in value each year, and, consequently, the amount shown on each bonus certificate is the 1945 value of that life-insurance policy which the Government has bought for each veteran. Naturally, that bonus certificate, therefore, is worth less in the year 1935 than it will be in the year 1945. Every year that the veteran holds on to his bonus certificate—which in reality is just a 20-year endowment life-insurance policy—makes that bonus certificate worth more money.

For example: In 1930 it was not worth half of the 1945 value. In the year 1935 it is worth more than it was in 1925. In the year 1945, when it matures, it will be worth the exact amount of money shown on the face of the certificate.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I think I have made clear to you first, that the bonus act awarded extra pay to all ex-service men at a dollar a day for service in the country and one dollar and a quarter a day for service outside the country during the World War. That when the amount of money found to be due each veteran had been ascertained plus 25 percent increase it was used to buy each veteran a 20-year endowment life-insurance policy, maturing in 1945. I have also shown that the present value of that endowment policy is, of course, less than the 1945 value will be.

So, if I have made all that plain to you, as I hope I have, we can now discuss with intelligence the various bills pending before Congress.

There are three bills now being discussed. I shall refer to them by the names by which they are best known to the public. First, there is the so-called "Patman bill"; secondly, the so-called "Vinson bill", and thirdly, the so-called "Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill."

The Patman bill and the Vinson bill are very much alike. The Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill differs from the first two.

The Patman and Vinson bills would pay off in cash the full 1945 value of the bonus certificates at once, all regardless of the fact that the present value of those certificates or endowment policies, as I have heretofore shown, is not what they will be worth in 1945.

On the other hand the third bill, called the "Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill", in effect gives to each veteran the present value of his bonus certificate.

Keep this essential difference in mind, that the Patman and Vinson bills pay off all the bonus certificates now in full, although they are now worth less than their 1945 value, while the Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill gives to each veteran a little more than the present value of his adjusted-service or bonus certificate. That is one of the principal points of difference between the bills, but there are other differences as well.

The Patman bill would pay off the veterans in greenbacks to be especially printed for that purpose. The Vinson bill would pay off the veterans in regular money, such as is now in use, but that bill does not provide where the money is to be obtained with which to pay the veterans. The Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill would substitute for each bonus certificate a regular Government bond, and such bond to mature in 1945, the same year that the bonus certificates mature. The face of each bond, plus the 10 annual interest-bearing coupons attached to it, would give to each veteran the exact sum of money which he would have coming to him because of his bonus certificate. Such bonds would be regular Government bonds. They are negotiable. If the veteran wanted to sell his bond now he would get its face value, which is slightly more than three-quarters of the 1945 value of his present bonus certificate.

If the veteran held on to his bond, then its face value, plus the annual interest-bearing coupons, would give him by 1945 the same amount of money he would get by surrendering his bonus certificate then.

These are the simple elements of the three bills. The Vinson bill would cost the Government, in principal and interest, about a billion dollars more by 1945 than was provided in the original bonus law passed in 1925.

Against this the Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill would not cost the Government any more or any less at any time than the bonus law originally provided.

Under the Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill the Government simply withdraws from the veteran one kind of obligation it already has out, called the "bonus certificate", and gives to that same veteran another kind of obligation in the form of a Government bond, both the bond and the certificate maturing at the same time. All it would do in fact would be to substitute a negotiable Government obligation—that is, a bond with coupons attached—for another kind of Government obligation—that is, the bonus certificate—which is not negotiable.

Under the Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill the veteran gets all that is coming to him now if he wants to sell his bond immediately, or all that the Government owes him now if he wants to sell his bond immediately, or more than his extra service pay was originally if the veteran wants to sell his bond immediately. The Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill makes it a crime, punishable by a fine of $10,000, for anyone to buy from a veteran a bond at less than its face value within a period of 6 months after the veteran receives the bond. This was inserted in the bill to prevent sharpers and speculators from exploiting the veterans and in an attempt to insure that each veteran would get in cash, should he desire to sell his bonds now, a hundred cents on the dollar of its face value.

Now, those who have been listening, I think, have had a clear and honest explanation of the essential elements of past and present bonus legislation. Which of these plans do you prefer? It would be but human for many veterans to want to get all that they can now, whether the Government actually owed such amounts or not. If you are a nonveteran, then you will perhaps be human enough to say that the veteran should not get anything until 1945, as now provided in the bonus law.

It would be wrong to decide such an important matter from the purely selfish viewpoint of the individual. That would neither make right nor patriotism.

The Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill supporters take the position that if the veteran is to be paid now, in this year 1935, he has no right to be paid more than the Government owes him now. Such people take the position that it is the part of justice to all parties concerned, the veteran and nonveteran, that the Government of the United States ought not to be asked to pay the veterans in 1935 more than it agreed to pay him in 1945.

Such a bill as the Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill creates no new Government obligation, for the adjusted-service certificates are now outstanding anyway. These are payable in 1945. Negotiable bonds, readily salable by any veteran who cares to do so, take the place of said adjusted-service certificates now outstanding; so that the Government's position is unchanged, while the veteran gets all that is now due him in good money and the taxpayer pays neither more nor less to provide the funds than he would pay in 1945 anyway.

I am an ex-soldier myself. I served on the battlefields of France. I was a machine gunner and had the honor to command about 2,200 men and 144 machine guns in actual combat. Many of the men of my command were killed and wounded in that terrific holocaust which plunged the world in misery. I am not unmindful of their sacrifices. I shall never forget the warm friendships, the comradeship of the officers and men with whom I served, many of whom went forward to death.

I say this not to be emotional, but because I think this permits me to see the soldiers' point of view, as I think I see the Government's point of view, and the point of view of the people at large.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are still in the midst of a world-wide depression; 22,000,000 people in this Republic look to Government for food and shelter. They are on the relief rolls. Ten or twelve million more are out of employment, hunting for work.

We should not lose sight of these conditions in considering payment of the bonus 10 years before it is due. The Patman and Vinson bills do pay more than is now due; the first, with printing-press money—a doubtful course for any country to embark upon—and the Vinson bill would add about a billion dollars more in interest to the expense of paying off the bonus than would be required, even if the Government waited until 1945 to cash in the bonus certificates. The President has stated that he will veto the Patman bill or the Vinson bill if either passes the Congress.

The Tydings-Andrews-Cochran bill gives to every veteran slightly more than three-quarters of the 1945 value of the bonus certificate but it costs the taxpayer no more than would have to be raised anyhow to pay off the present bonus certificates in 1945. In short, it does justice to the ex-service man, it does justice to the Government, it does justice to the taxpayer. It is mindful of the misery, the unemployment, and the relief now being administered in all parts of the country.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. COPELAND submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5913) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 9, 19, 24, 27, 30, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 23, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$87,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "seven retired officers on active duty, $9,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$161,063,594"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$160,778,594"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$297,155"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,549,104"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,452,304"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,452,304"; and the Senate agree to the same.

On amendments numbered 7, 10, 17, 25, 26, 28, and 32 the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

ROYAL S. COPELAND,
CARL HAYDEN,
MORRIS SHEPPARD,
PETER NORBECK,
JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

TILMAN B. PARKS,
THOMAS L. BLANTON,
THOMAS S. MCMILLAN,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOHN F. DOCKWEILER,
CHESTER C. BOLTON,
D. LANE POWERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4442) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order previously entered, amendments of the Committee on Appropriations are first to be considered. The clerk will state the first amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Treasury Department—Office of Commissioner of Accounts and Deposits", on page 7, after line 1, to strike out:

Salaries: For the Commissioner Accounts and Deposits and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $100,000.

DIVISION OF DISBURSEMENT

Salaries and expenses: For personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, stationery, travel, rental of equipment, and all other necessary miscellaneous and contingent expenses, $710,700: *Provided*, That with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget there may be transferred to this appropriation from funds available for new activities and/or for the expansion of existing activities such sums as may be necessary to cover the additional expense incurred in performing the function of disbursement therefor.

DIVISION OF BOOKKEEPING AND WARRANTS

Salaries: For the chief of the division and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $168,960.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

For Commissioner of Accounts and Deposits and other personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, including the Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants and the Division of Disbursement, and including also for the Division of Disbursement stationery, travel, rental of equipment, and all other necessary miscellaneous and contingent expenses, $996,620.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Internal Revenue", on page 15, line 4, after the word "services" and the semicolon, to insert "cost of acquisition and maintenance of automobiles seized for violations of internal-revenue laws delivered to the Secretary of the Treasury for use in administration of the law under his jurisdiction;"; so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses of assessing and collecting the internal-revenue taxes and to administer the applicable provisions of the act of October 28, 1919, as amended, and supplemented (U. S. C., title 27), the act of March 22, 1933 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 27, secs. 64–a to 64–o), the act of January 11, 1934 (48 Stat. 313), Public Resolutions Nos. 40 and 41, approved June 18, 1934, (48 Stat. 1020–1021); and the internal-revenue laws pursuant to the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 5, secs. 281–281–e), the act of May 27, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 27, secs. 103–108), and Executive Order No. 6639, dated March 10, 1934; including the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Assistant General Counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, an assistant to the Commissioner, a special deputy commissioner, 4 deputy commissioners, 1 stamp agent (to be reimbursed by the stamp manufacturers), and the necessary officers, collectors, deputy collectors, attorneys, experts, agents, accountants, inspectors, investigators, chemists, supervisors, storekeeper-gagers, guards, clerks, janitors, and messengers in the District of Columbia, the several collection districts, the several divisions of internal-revenue agents, and the several supervisory districts, to be appointed as provided by law; the securing of evidence of violations of the acts, the cost of chemical analyses made by others than employees of the United States and expenses incident to such chemists testifying when necessary; telegraph and telephone service, rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, postage, freight, express, necessary expenses incurred in making investigations in connection with the enrollment or disbarment of practitioners before the Treasury Department in internal-revenue matters, expenses of seizure and sale, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses, including stenographic reporting services; cost of acquisition and maintenance of automobiles seized for violations of internal-revenue laws delivered to the Secretary of the Treasury for use in administration of the law under his jurisdiction; for the purchase (not exceeding $150,000), exchange, hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary, for official use of the Alcohol Tax Unit in field work; and the purchase of such supplies, equipment, furniture, mechanical devices, laboratory supplies, law books and books of reference; and such other articles as may be necessary for use in the District of Columbia, the several collection districts, the several divisions of internal-revenue agents, and the several supervisory districts, $48,000,000, of which amount not to exceed $9,588,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 5, to insert:

That the proviso of the paragraph under the heading "Bureau of Internal Revenue" contained in the Emergency Appropriation

Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934, be amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That from and after May 15, 1935, no part of the appropriation made herein, or heretofore made, shall be used to pay the salaries of persons who were dropped from the service under the Executive Order No. 6166 of June 10, 1933, and reinstated, transferred, or promoted to position in the Bureau of Industrial Alcohol, or in the Alcohol Tax Unit, upon certificates issued by the Civil Service Commission, between January 30, 1934, and May 10, 1934, unless such persons shall have passed an appropriate open competitive examination held by the Civil Service Commission after June 19, 1934, such persons being those who were separated from the service by Executive order of June 10, 1933, and who, under the terms of such order, were ineligible for reappointment unless such reappointments were made before December 10, 1933: *Provided further*, That inasmuch as the Treasury Department, under the advice of the Attorney General, has given the proviso referred to above a construction including other employees not intended by the Congress to be included in that proviso, and advising the Treasury Department that it could retain such employees without pay, there is hereby appropriated for salaries from December 1, 1934, to May 15, 1935, both dates inclusive, in the offices as follows: Bureau of Customs, $2,357.14; Bureau of Internal Revenue, $1,367,006.91; Bureau of Narcotics, $8,642.85; and Secret Service Division, $7,857.14; in all, $1,385,864.04; to pay all of said employees up to and including May 15, 1935: *Provided further*, That the employees, other than those heretofore designated, may be retained by the Treasury Department, but those designated in the first proviso hereof shall not be retained after May 15, 1935, by the Treasury Department unless they have passed an appropriate open competitive examination held by the Civil Service Commission after June 19, 1934, and, if retained, shall not be paid out of this appropriation or any other appropriation made by this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Secret Service Division", on page 26, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$57,000"; and in line 13, after the word "sum", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$57,000", so as to read:

Suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes: For expenses incurred under the authority or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury in detecting, arresting, and delivering into the custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction dealers and pretended dealers in counterfeit money and persons engaged in counterfeiting, forging, and altering United States notes, bonds, national-bank notes, Federal Reserve notes, Federal Reserve bank notes, and other obligations and securities of the United States and of foreign governments, as well as the coins of the United States and of foreign governments, and other crimes against the laws of the United States relating to the Treasury Department and the several branches of the public service under its control; purchase (not to exceed $57,000), exchange, hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; purchase of arms and ammunition; traveling expenses; and for no other purpose whatsoever, except in the performance of other duties specifically authorized by law, and in the protection of the person of the President and the members of his immediate family and of the person chosen to be President of the United States, $675,000, of which sum $57,000 shall be immediately available:

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 14, after the word "of", to strike out "this amount" and insert "the amount herein appropriated", so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That no part of the amount herein appropriated shall be used in defraying the expenses of any person subpenaed by the United States courts to attend any trial before a United States court or preliminary examination before any United States commissioner, which expenses shall be paid from the appropriation for "Fees of witnesses, United States courts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Procurement Division, Public Works Branch", on page 37, line 1, after the word "for", to strike out "transportations" and insert "transportation", so as to read:

General administrative expenses: For architectural, engineering, mechanical, administrative, clerical, and other personal services, traveling expenses, including expenses of employees directed by the Secretary of the Treasury to attend meetings of technical and professional societies in connection with subjects related to the work of the Division of Procurement, Public Works Branch, and transportation of household goods, incident to change of headquarters of all employees engaged in field activities, not to exceed 5,000 pounds at any one time, together with the necessary expenses incident to packing and draying same; advertising, testing instruments, law books, books of reference, technical periodicals and journals, drafting materials, especially prepared paper, typewriting machines, adding machines and other mechanical labor-saving devices, and exchange of same, carpets, electric-light fixtures, furniture, equipment, and repairs thereto, telegraph and telephone service, freight, expressage, and postage incident to the transportation of drawings to and from the office and such other contingencies, articles, services, or supplies as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary and specially order or approve in connection with any of the work of the Procurement Division, Public Works Branch; rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including ground rent of the Federal building at Salamanca, N. Y., for which payment may be made in advance; $920,000, of which amount not to exceed $494,940 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed $289,060 for personal services in the field; *Provided*, That the foregoing appropriations shall not be available for the cost of surveys, plaster models, progress photographs, test pits and borings, or mill and shop inspections, but the cost thereof shall be construed to be chargeable against the construction appropriations of the respective projects to which they relate: *Provided further*, That no expenditure shall be made hereunder for transportation of operating supplies for public buildings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 10, after the word "professional", to strike out "and/or" and insert "and", so as to read:

Outside professional services, public buildings: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain outside professional and technical services, as provided by the Public Buildings Act approved May 25, 1926 (U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 40, sec. 342), and by the act approved March 31, 1930 (46 Stat., p. 137), and to pay reasonable compensation for such services, and to employ appraisers, when necessary, by contract or otherwise, $100,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Post Office Department—Salaries in Bureaus and Offices", on page 46, at the end of line 21, to increase the appropriation for personal services in the office of the chief inspector from $191,000 to $192,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, at the end of line 22, to increase the appropriation for personal services in the office of the purchasing agent from $35,760 to $39,260.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, at the end of line 23, to increase the appropriation for personal services in the Bureau of Accounts from $92,380 to $94,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent Expenses, Post Office Department", on page 48, line 4, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$875,000" and insert "$900,000", so as to read:

For printing and binding for the Post Office Department, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, $900,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Chief Inspector", on page 50, line 13, after the word "and", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "535 inspectors, $2,098,000" and insert "550 inspectors, $2,140,000", so as to read:

Salaries of inspectors: For salaries of 15 inspectors in charge of divisions and 550 inspectors, $2,140,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 10, after the word "robbers" to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$55,000"; so as to read:

Payment of rewards: For payment of rewards for the detection, arrest, and conviction of post-office burglars, robbers, and highway mail robbers, $55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General", on page 52, line 21, after the word "offices" to strike out "$65,000" and insert "$75,000"; so as to read:

Unusual conditions: For unusual conditions at post offices, $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 10, after the word "delivery" to strike out "$1,595,000" and insert $1,600,000"; so as to read:

Village delivery service: For village delivery service in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class, and in communities adjacent to cities having city delivery, $1,600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General", on page 55, line 6, after the name "Railway Mail Service", to strike out "$52,400,000" and insert "$52,500,000"; so as to read:

Railway Mail Service, salaries: For 15 division superintendents, 15 assistant division superintendents, 2 assistant superintendents at large, 1 assistant superintendent in charge of car construction, 121 chief clerks, 121 assistant chief clerks, clerks in charge of sections in the offices of division superintendents, railway postal clerks, substitute railway postal clerks, joint employees, and laborers in the Railway Mail Service, $52,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 12, after the word "countries" and the comma to insert "fiscal year 1936 and prior years", so as to read:

Balances due foreign countries: For balances due foreign countries, fiscal year 1936 and prior years, $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General", on page 59, line 18, after the word "complete", to strike out "and/or" and insert "and", so as to read:

Post-office stationery, equipment, and supplies: For stationery for the Postal Service, including the money-order and registry system; and also for the purchase of supplies for the Postal Savings System, including rubber stamps, canceling devices, certificates, envelops, and stamps for use in evidencing deposits, and free penalty envelops; and for the reimbursement of the Secretary of the Treasury for expenses incident to the preparation, issue, and registration of the bonds authorized by the act of June 25, 1910 (U. S. C., title 39, sec. 760); for miscellaneous equipment and supplies, including the purchase and repair of furniture, package boxes, posts, trucks, baskets, satchels, straps, letterbox paint, baling machines, perforating machines, duplicating machines, printing presses, directories, cleaning supplies, and the manufacture, repair, and exchange of equipment, the erection and painting of letter-box equipment, and for the purchase and repair of presses and dies for use in the manufacture of letter boxes; not to exceed $10,000 for the salvage, repair, assembly, and installation in units of lockboxes obtained from public buildings demolished or no longer used for post offices and for the purchase and installation of new lockboxes to complete and supplement such units, to be furnished to post offices of the second and third classes; for postmarking, rating, money-order stamps, and electrotype plates and repairs to same; metal, rubber, and combination type, dates and figures, type holders, ink pads for canceling and stamping purposes, and for the purchase, exchange, and repair of typewriting machines, envelop-opening machines, and computing machines, copying presses, numbering machines, time recorders, letter balances, scales (exclusive of dormant or built-in platform scales in Federal buildings), test weights, and miscellaneous articles purchased and furnished directly to the Postal Service, including complete equipment and furniture for post offices in leased and rented quarters; for miscellaneous expenses in the preparation and publication of post-route maps and rural-delivery maps or blueprints, including tracing for photolithographic reproduction; for other expenditures necessary and incidental to post offices of the first, second, and third classes, and offices of the fourth class having or to have rural-delivery service, and for letter boxes; for the purchase of atlases and geographical and technical works not to exceed $1,500; for wrapping twine and tying devices; for expenses incident to the shipment of supplies, including hardware, boxing, packing, and not exceeding $44,500 for the pay of employees in connection therewith in the District of Columbia; for rental, purchase, exchange, and repair of canceling machines and motors, mechanical mail-handling apparatus, and other labor-saving devices, including cost of power in rented buildings and miscellaneous expenses of installation and operation of same, including not to exceed $28,000 for salaries of 10 traveling mechanicians, and for traveling expenses, $2,260,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 7, after the word "activities", to strike out "$12,650,000" and insert "$13,000,000", so as to read:

Operating force, public buildings: For personal services in connection with the operation of public buildings, including the Washington Post Office and the Customhouse Building in the District of Columbia, operated by the Post Office Department, together with the grounds thereof and the equipment and furnishings therein, including telephone operators for the operation of telephone switchboards or equivalent telephone switchboard equipment in such buildings jointly serving in each case two or more governmental activities, $13,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 23, after the word "herein", to strike out "$4,600,000" and insert "$4,700,000", so as to read:

Operating supplies, public buildings: For fuel, steam, gas, and electric current for lighting, heating, and power purposes, water, ice, lighting supplies, removal of ashes and rubbish, snow and ice, cutting grass and weeds, washing towels, telephone service for custodial forces, and for miscellaneous services and supplies, tools and appliances, for the operation of completed and occupied public buildings and grounds, including mechanical and electrical equipment, but not the repair thereof, operated by the Post Office Department, including the Washington Post Office and the Customhouse Building in the District of Columbia, and for the transportation of articles and supplies authorized herein, $4,700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 16, after the name "Post Office Department", to strike out "$550,000" and insert "$600,000", so as to read:

Furniture, carpets, and safes, public buildings: For the procurement, including transportation, of furniture, carpets, safes, and repairs of same, for use in public buildings which are now, or may hereafter be, operated by the Post Office Department, $600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 25, after the word "transfer", to insert "or on reappointment heretofore or hereafter at another official station under the provisions of section 19 of Executive Order No. 6166 of June 10, 1933, and for the expenses incurred in packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of household effects and other property, not exceeding in any one case 5,000 pounds, of employees so reappointed", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. Appropriations for the fiscal year 1936 available for expenses of travel of civilian officers and employees of the executive departments and establishments shall be available also for expenses of travel performed by them on transfer from one official station to another when authorized by the head of the department or establishment concerned in the order directing such transfer or on reappointment heretofore or hereafter at another official station under the provisions of section 19 of Executive Order No. 6166 of June 10, 1933, and for the expenses incurred in packing, crating, drayage, and transportation of household effects and other property, not exceeding in any one case 5,000 pounds, of employees so reappointed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 13, to insert the following section:

SEC. 4. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the payment of personal services not specifically authorized by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 16, to insert the following section:

SEC. 5. That no part of the money appropriated under this act shall be paid to any person for the filing of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate upon vote has failed to confirm the nomination of said person, or for the payment of an acting official whose name has been submitted to the Senate and withdrawn.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 23, to change the section number from 4 to 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I submit a further committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided further, That for the purpose of concentration, upon the initiation of the Commissioner of Industrial Alcohol and under regulations prescribed by him, distilled spirits may be removed from any internal-revenue bonded warehouse to any other such warehouse, and may be bottled in bond in any such warehouse before or after payment of the tax, and the commissioner shall prescribe the form and penal sum of bond covering distilled spirits in internal-revenue bonded warehouses and in transit between such warehouses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill if the amendment just agreed to has anything to do with the Alcohol Unit employees?

Mr. GLASS. It has not.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. Let me ask the Senator what the provision is in the bill, and if we have reached that provision, which touches upon the dismissal of employees in the Alcoholic Unit last year?

Mr. GLASS. That has been adopted.

Mr. McNARY. I shall ask for reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was adopted. At the proper time I shall do that in behalf of my colleague.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what effect the amendment has upon the restoration of the employees?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall be glad to explain that to the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. If there is to be discussion touching this matter, I desire my colleague [Mr. STEIWER] to be present. Therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Costigan	Lonergan	Robinson
Ashurst	Couzens	Long	Russell
Austin	Cutting	McAdoo	Schall
Bachman	Dickinson	McCarran	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Donahey	McGill	Sheppard
Barbour	Duffy	McKellar	Shipstead
Barkley	Fletcher	McNary	Smith
Bilbo	Frazier	Maloney	Steiwer
Black	George	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gerry	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Moore	Townsend
Bulkley	Glass	Murphy	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Murray	Truman
Burke	Guffey	Neely	Tydings
Byrd	Hale	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Clark	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh
Connally	King	Pope	Wheeler
Coolidge	La Follette	Radcliffe	
Copeland	Logan	Reynolds	

Mr. ROBINSON. I reannounce the absences announced on the former roll call for the reasons then stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, there was so much confusion in the Chamber that I did not catch the question asked by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], but now I understand what it is and I can explain the provision of the bill to which he referred. The committee amendment which I sent to the desk had no reference to that particular subject. That amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments have all been agreed to, and the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee offered an amendment in behalf of the committee, which has been adopted. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to explain the meaning of the amendment referred to by the Senator from Oregon, I shall be glad to do so, or I shall yield to any other Senator who wishes to discuss it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss it, but I should like to have an explanation of the amendment itself.

Mr. GLASS. The amendment mentioned has reference to what is known in common parlance as the "McKellar amendment", attached to the appropriation bill last year. It related to the employment in the Treasury Department of certain persons, as the Senator contended, contrary to the Executive order of June 10, 1933. These employees, in consequence of the repeal of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution, were transferred en bloc from the Prohibition Unit to the Treasury Department; and it seemed from the testimony before the committee that they were very carefully picked so that all the transfers were of persons of one political faith.

In consequence of that, the Senator from Tennessee offered an amendment at the last session requiring that no part of the appropriation then made should be used to pay these 1,100 persons. As a result, these persons were continued in the service, as it seemed to the committee, in plain violation of the Presidential Executive order, but without pay.

The committee came to the conclusion that the persons thus retained in the service were innocent victims of the rider to the appropriation bill offered by the Senator from Tennessee; that they were in no degree to be blamed; that they had rendered service by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury in his turn had acted upon a rather remarkable opinion of the Attorney General which seemed to the committee to be in absolute contravention of the plain text of the Presidential Executive order.

Therefore the committee concluded that these employees ought to be paid; and accordingly this provision of the bill provides for their payment until the 15th of May next. Some 500 of them, I believe, or perhaps more, are put upon notice that on or before the 15th of May next they may be continued in the service only upon passing a competitive examination.

I may add that the Secretary of the Treasury, who appeared in person before the Appropriations Committee and spoke very earnestly in behalf of these employees, is now entirely content with this provision of the bill. He so informed me. He thinks it is a fair compromise from what he first proposed and hopes this provision will prevail.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. GLASS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that the original provision called for the dismissal of only about 700—698, I believe, to be exact—employees who had been put back in the service contrary to the Presidential Executive order to which the Senator has referred; but by a construction of the Attorney General the amendment was given a scope which the Congress did not intend, and certainly I did not intend—and I prepared it—and it was made to apply to about 1,300 employees, if I remember correctly.

This amendment provides that it shall apply only to the 698 employees originally referred to, those employees having been selected by a young man by the name of Berney, and put back in the service without regard to the President's Executive order. The other 600 that the Attorney General construed came within the provisions of the law are retained in the service. In addition to that, about 30 percent of the 700 who have since taken an examination and passed it will be retained in the service, so that those who go out will be in the neighborhood of 450 or 500, as stated.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES. Of the men who were in the service, and who were required to stand the open competitive examination about which we read in the newspapers, do I understand that those who failed to stand the open competitive examination now go out of the service?

Mr. McKELLAR. Those who failed to stand the examination will go out on May 15; and if the Senator could see the answers they made, he would see why they ought to go out, because I think most of them, probably all of them, made less than 50 percent.

Mr. BYRNES. Did the Senator see the questions asked in that examination?

Mr. McKELLAR. I may have, though I do not recall seeing them.

Mr. BYRNES. Does the Senator believe he himself could stand that examination?

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly do. I will tell the Senator why I say that. The Secretary of the Treasury said he did not know whether he could stand it or not. The fact is that 30 percent of the 700 stood it.

Mr. GLASS. That is not the question. I do not believe any Senator could have stood it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know. I never saw it, so far as I recall, so I cannot say.

Mr. GLASS. But whether any Senator could have stood the examination or not, it was required to be held. I think there are many civil-service examinations that no Senator could stand, for that matter; but they are nevertheless required to be held, and only the persons who stand such examinations are subject to employment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GLASS. I yield.

Mr. KING. Will the amendment which is under consideration permit a reexamination of those who may have failed in the open competitive examination?

Mr. GLASS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. KING. Then they are not foreclosed?

Mr. GLASS. They are not foreclosed from taking the competitive examination between now and the 15th of May, and may be employed if they pass it.

Mr. KING. I have understood that a number of persons who did take the examination were not regarded as eligible, in some instances, because of failure really to comprehend some of the questions asked or to take into account some of the factors that should have been considered. What I am trying to get at is, Would they be permitted again to take an examination?

Mr. McKELLAR. If an appropriate civil-service examination is conducted, they can take it at any time. The fact that they failed in one examination does not preclude them from taking another, but there is no provision for a civil-service examination in this amendment. However, they have already had the examination. I asked the civil-service officials regarding it, and they told me that about the same number stood this examination that usually stand such examinations. In other words, about 30 percent of those taking the examination passed, and that is just about the usual percentage that pass.

Mr. GLASS. There is no question in my mind, and I think there was none in the minds of the committee, that the Treasury Department, acting upon an extraordinary opinion of the Department of Justice, was solely to blame for this entire difficulty. As I see it, the action of the Department was as clear a violation of the plain Executive order of the President as could have been perpetrated; but these persons were not to blame. They were retained in employment by authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, who in turn acted under an opinion of the Attorney General that was not necessarily binding, but it was the opinion of the Attorney General; and therefore this amendment proposes to pay all those persons up to the 15th of next May.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

Mr. GLASS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I quite agree with the conclusion of the committee so far as the pay of these employees is concerned. It is just and right that they should be paid.

With reference to this examination, I have in my office a sample of the examination. I have not it here; but the general impression, which I think is quite universally agreed to, is that the examination was not a test of the qualifications of the persons who took the examination.

In other words, it was technical, to some extent, and had to do with questions with which these employees have no relation whatever. The general impression is that as an examination it was a fraud. Such an examination may be held under the law, and we have to abide by it, perhaps, but that kind of an examination should not prevail as a test of the qualifications of these persons for the work in which they have to engage.

If they can be allowed another opportunity, as the Senator from Utah suggests, that might cure the evil. If a reasonable examination may be given, we will have to take our chances on that, I suppose. But I believe these persons ought to be given an opportunity to stand an examination testing their qualifications for the positions in question. That would be reasonable. I do not think they ought to be excluded by reason of the fact that they took the bogus, fake examination, because they had to take it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. GLASS. I want to repeat that I do not think the Senate is going into the business of stipulating the nature of examinations which the Civil Service Commission shall submit. I think many of the questions are nonsensical and have no relation to the real capacity of the people who take the examinations, but I do not imagine the Senate wants to go into that matter.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I am in favor of the amendment, because I think these employees who have worked in the Department are entitled to consideration, no matter by whom the mistake was made. But I am far more interested in the civil-service examination that was given than I am in the amendment.

I do not know what control we have over the Civil Service Commission. Perhaps the Chairman of the Civil Service Committee of the Senate knows.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator seemed to address me when he said that. I am not the Chairman of the Committee on Civil Service. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] is the chairman. I happen to be on the committee, and have been for many years.

I wish to say that the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] is wholly in error in what he says. I have never seen the examination, so I do not know what it contains; but I have heard the same reports the Senator has heard, and he knows reports have been flying thick and fast for some months about the matter. I called the Civil Service Commission about the matter, and they say that those who took the examination passed in about the same proportion in which candidates pass other examinations; in other words, about 30 percent of them qualified.

I do not know that we ought to go into the question of civil-service examinations. Of those who took the examination some passed and some did not pass. It appears to me that if the Government is to have competent employees it ought to have those who are able to take the examinations, if that is the way to control the selections for the Government service.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I want to deal with the question of competent men. I want to know whether the Senator thinks that the only competent men in this country are lawyers. We are both lawyers. Does he think lawyers are the only competent men for every activity on earth?

Mr. McKELLAR. The question answers itself. Of course, I do not think any such thing.

Mr. PITTMAN. Very well. There is what we call the Alcohol Beverage Unit, and there are investigators in that unit. Those men are detectives. That is their business. They go out to arrest bootleggers, to destroy stills, so that the Government may collect on the legitimate sale of liquor the revenue to which it is entitled under the law. Today there is practically as much bootlegging in the United States as there was before the repeal of the prohibition amendment. I assert that today not one-half of the revenue which the Government should collect on liquor is being collected. I assert that over half of the alcoholic beverages sold in this country, with the exception of beer, are " bootleg ", and that the Government is receiving no revenue on them whatever.

What is the reason for that? Every one of the supervisors has reported to the Treasury Department, " It is because we have not men competent to arrest these lawbreakers."

In the southern part of my State today there are stills in every gulch where there is a spring. The whisky manufactured there is being taken by truckload into southern California and into Utah. Those who make it are as desperate criminals as Dillinger ever was. Their leader is a man who was sentenced to life imprisonment for murder, and in some way, which I do not understand, he got out of the penitentiary, and is now in charge of those illicit operations.

The Government has only four enforcement officers in that State, which is almost as large as all the New England States, a mountainous, difficult country to get through, with gulches

everywhere. These four Government officers are supposed to look after that whole territory, and arrest the gangs of outlaws.

Two of these officers were sent recently to arrest a gang of these bootleggers. They located the still; they located the truck which was in readiness to take the liquor; they followed the truck at night, and a car came between them and the truck with machine guns pointed out through the windows.

The Government enforcement officers in Nevada were ex-soldiers. One of them had served as a Texas Ranger. They were courageous men; they knew criminals; they knew how to capture them; and they have captured a number of them. These men took the examination here in question, and they failed, and let me state why. In the first place, if one is a graduate lawyer, he is competent to take the examination. If, not being a graduate lawyer, he has served 5 years in the actual practice of the law, he is entitled to take the examination. If one has had 5 years' experience as an investigator, he is entitled to take the examination. But there are exceptions. If one has been a raider in the prohibition forces, he is not entitled to take the examination; he is not an investigator, but a raider. If one is a policeman, he is not an investigator, and he cannot take the examination. If one has been a Texas Ranger, he is not an investigator, and is not entitled to take the examination.

In addition, Mr. President, in the examination the applicants were asked, What is the capital of Siam, and What is the capital of Siberia, if it has one? They were asked such questions as that. The Senator from Virginia said he could not pass the examination. I know well enough I could not pass it. There were questions asked which might have been asked of someone who was attempting to qualify as an instructor in a university.

Mr. President, we want men who are courageous, who are honest, men who are used to dealing with criminals. We want men like the Texas Rangers, men like the Canadian "Mounties"; and such men are lucky if they have ever had a common public-school education.

How are we to get such men into the service? That is what I want to accomplish. We pass a bill requiring men who have served their lives as investigators, as law officers, to take an examination prepared by a professor from the Northwestern University, who would not know a criminal if he saw him; and if he saw him, the criminal would probably borrow money from him to send home to his aged mother. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did not the Senator say a while ago that the law was not now being enforced? He has just told us of the kind of men they had in Nevada, one a Texas Ranger, and another a policeman, and men who had had experience of that kind, and yet he says they are not enforcing the law. How does he make the two statements jibe?

Mr. PITTMAN. What a magnificent argument the Senator from Tennessee makes. I stated to the Senate that in an area as large as the New England States there were 4 men with 2,000 crooks to handle.

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as I can find out from the list none of the men on it is from Nevada. I think the Senator is talking about something with which he is not familiar, because, so far as I can find from the list—though I have not completed my examination of it as yet——

Mr. PITTMAN. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. McKELLAR. The list of those who go out under this amendment. I do not think there are any from Nevada at all.

Mr. PITTMAN. I am not interested in the amendment. I know well enough that three of the best men we had out there were on the deferred list; they were let out, but stayed on and have worked, waiting to see what was going to happen. They were let out, and they have been working ever since in the hope that they would be paid, in the hope that somebody would have some common sense with regard to the administration of the civil service.

There is a committee of the United States Senate and there is one of the House of Representatives whose duty it is to look after civil-service legislation. No civil-service legislation is ever reported to the Senate. I do not know who is on the Civil Service Commission, and one does not know unless he goes and asks questions about it. It is the biggest absurdity that ever existed in all the world. Now, when the Treasury Department knows it is not collecting half the revenue it should receive it proposes to put on a lot of young lawyers. I have great sympathy for young lawyers. I, myself, spent a long time as a young lawyer. But I do not want to have them put in as detectives whose duty it is to protect my life and the lives of the members of my family. It seems to me that the members of the Committee on the Civil Service of the Senate and that of the House, instead of constantly coming in and voting for everything to go under the civil service, ought to investigate the civil service and see if some way cannot be devised by which common sense may rule in this matter.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I think much of the trouble in this matter arises from the fact that Congress undertook to prescribe the kind of examination which should be provided, an open competitive examination. Such officers as have been described by the Senator from Nevada, like the ex-service man, for instance, who had shown his ability as an officer, were required to stand an open competitive examination. Had it been a noncompetitive examination, in which event their experience would have been given its proper weight, we would not have had so many able, experienced officers removed from the service. I know that in my own State two or three men who had been in the service for years, who were recognized as the best officers in the service, stood this examination. The Senator from Tennessee thinks it was an easy examination, but I saw a number of the questions——

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, Mr. President, I never saw the examination. I do not know whether it was easy or not.

Mr. BYRNES. I am glad the Senator tells me that. Had he seen the examination, had he seen the questions asked in that examination, he would have known how some of us feel toward the examination. The man who has been working as a prohibition agent for a number of years, who has been out of school for years, and who succeeds in passing that examination, is a remarkable, an unusual man. I believe if the Senator is now going to insist upon the adoption of this amendment and is going to provide again for an open competitive examination, that he is mistaken in doing so, and that it should be a noncompetitive examination, so that the man who has not recently been studying algebra or geometry, but who has been serving as an official enforcing the law, would have a fair chance to get a decent rating in the examination.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Under the practical working of the provision complained of there was eliminated one of the best peace officers in the whole western region of the country. He had been engaged under the Bureau of Indian Affairs in working on liquor violations, and was an excellent man; but he failed in the technical examination. As a matter of fact, that man lost one of his legs in the Government service, and was one of the very best peace officers it would be possible to find. Yet he was eliminated by reason of his failure to pass the technical examination which he had to take.

Mr. McKELLAR. What was his name? If the Senator from Montana can give me his name we can tell whether he is on the list.

Mr. WHEELER. I can give the Senator the name of the man.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator from Montana is mistaken about that case.

Mr. WHEELER. I have given the information which I received regarding this man.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. KING. I desire to ask the Senator if he does not construe the language of the amendment as prohibiting a further examination; in other words, all are concluded by the examination which was taken.

Mr. BYRNES. Here is the language which is vital to the amendment, as I see it, on page 17, line 11:

Provided further, That the employees, other than those heretofore designated, may be retained by the Treasury Department, but those designated in the first proviso hereof—

Which includes the man the Senator from Montana referred to—

shall not be retained after May 15, 1935.

In other words, this is the direction by the Congress that an individual shall not be retained unless he has passed an appropriate, open, competitive examination held by the Civil Service Commission after June 19, 1934. I see what the Senator from Utah has in mind; that unless the employee passed an examination held since June 19, 1934, which has already been held, that he cannot be retained. Is that the point the Senator has in mind?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. And that is provided in the law.

Mr. KING. And he could not take another examination.

Mr. BYRNES. No; he would have no chance to take another examination.

Mr. McKELLAR. Until one is called, no man has a right to take an examination. He can only take one when it is called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator from South Carolina concluded?

Mr. BYRNES. I have.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to give the exact facts by which these 704 employees were separated from the service. The President, on June 10, 1933, issued the following order, which separated all these individuals from the service:

All personnel employed in connection with the work of an abolished agency or function disposed of shall be separated from the service of the United States, except that the head of any successor agency, subject to my approval, may, within a period of 4 months after transfer or consolidation, reappoint any of such personnel required for the work of the successive agency. * * *

That was 4 months from August 10. In violation of that order the Department undertook to have these men reappointed, and here is the way they did it: I have here the testimony which was taken before the Civil Service Committee. Mr. E. E. Berney, of the Treasury Department, was intrusted with the selection of these men for reappointment and restoration to the service, and following are some of the questions which were asked him and his answers thereto:

Where are you from?
Mr. BERNEY. From central Pennsylvania.
Are you a Democrat or a Republican?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, who asked that question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I did. I will read out the names if the Senator wishes me to do so. I was reading it in the form indicated in order to shorten the presentation. To read the names each time will lengthen it.

Mr. BYRNES. I want to know who asked the questions.

Mr. McKELLAR. I asked the questions all the way through.

Are you a Democrat or Republican?
I do not know.
You do not know? An expert in the Bureau of Prohibition, and you do not know whether you are a Democrat or a Republican?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator tell us what the difference is between a Democrat and a Republican?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator does not know now after his long service he will never know, and there is no use to tell him.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am asking for the benefit of others.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps so. I am sure the Senator is. The Senator was not asking for his own benefit.

Senator McKELLAR. You do not know? An expert in the Bureau of Prohibition and not know whether you are a Democrat or a Republican?

Mr. BERNEY. If I may place my own test, I assume the test of a man's political faith is determined by his registration in a primary. I never registered to vote in a primary in my life. I voted once in my life, in the State of Connecticut, at a general election, and I have never lined up with a political party; so I do not know.

Senator McKELLAR. How did you vote then?

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McKELLAR. Surely.

Mr. STEIWER. Am I correct in my understanding that the amendment which is now being discussed, on pages 16 and 17 of the bill, was agreed to earlier in the morning?

Mr. GLASS. Yes. It has been agreed to, and no one has moved to reconsider.

Mr. STEIWER. Evidently we are leading into a rather serious and interesting discussion here. I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee would not now permit us to straighten out the parliamentary situation by agreeing to a reconsideration of the action by which the committee amendment, on pages 16 and 17 of the bill, was agreed to?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER] asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on pages 16 and 17 of the bill was agreed to be reconsidered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. STEIWER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I may want to debate this question.

Mr. GLASS. I do not think the Senator from Tennessee is exactly in charge of this bill and can agree to a reconsideration. The Senate agrees to reconsideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. I had no desire to do that. I merely said I had no objection.

Mr. GLASS. I think we have had the most irrelevant discussion here on a provision of the bill which has already been passed. I personally have no objection to a reconsideration.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. I think the RECORD will show that before the last quorum call the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] asked that the vote by which this amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. GLASS. No, Mr. President; I do not think he asked for a reconsideration. The Senator from Oregon said before he proceeded further in the matter he should like to have his colleague here.

Mr. STEIWER. I think no reconsideration was then had, but I have made a request for unanimous consent to have the vote reconsidered.

Mr. GLASS. I have no objection, but I should think the Senate ought to pass upon that question.

Mr. STEIWER. May I ask of the Chair if the Chair did not announce that reconsideration was had without objection?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair asked if there was any objection to reconsideration on the request of the Senator from Oregon. The Chair heard no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. STEIWER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask unanimous consent at this time to present an amendment which was presented to the Committee on Appropriations after the pending bill had been reported. The facts were presented to the committee, and it was agreed in committee that there would be no objection to it. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. KING. Let the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, line 6, it is proposed, after the word "force", to strike out the numerals "$253,668" and to insert in lieu thereof "$263,668, of which $10,000 shall be immediately available for the suppression of an epidemic of typhus fever."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Was it the Senator's request that that amendment lie on the table?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; that it be acted on now. I offer the amendment now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is an amendment pending at this time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] asks unanimous consent that his amendment take precedence over the pending amendment and that it be acted upon at this time. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question reverts to the pending committee amendment on pages 16 and 17 of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I continue to read from the testimony:

Senator McKELLAR. How did you vote then?
Mr. BERNEY. I voted on a machine.
Senator McKELLAR. I know; but how did you vote? Did you vote for the Democratic candidate or for the Republican candidate?

This man is drawing $6,000 a year from the Treasury Department in this unit.

Mr. BERNEY. I voted for both.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. That shows that the man was a remarkably wise man.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree to the statement in the sense the Senator has in mind.

Mr. NORRIS. We find in all our investigations that the men of great wealth who manipulate political parties contribute to both of them; and that man was getting along well; he was a hundred percent wise.

Mr. McKELLAR. He was getting along. If the Senator will wait a few moments, he will see how well he was getting along.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have been trying to listen to this discussion, but there is so much confusion that I was unable to hear the answer which the Senator just read. Will the Senator again read the answer which the Senator from Nebraska said was so good?

Mr. McKELLAR. He said he voted for both Democratic and Republican candidates for Governor of Connecticut. That is all there was to it.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I continue to read:

Senator McKELLAR. You voted for both the Democratic and the Republican candidate at the same time?
Mr. BERNEY. I certainly did.

This man was educated at Yale University. I believe he testified he graduated there, and had been working for the Government since 1918, when he went into the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. He entered that Bureau by standing a competitive examination for claims examiner and reviewer. I am giving the record from the hearings. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], who is present, will remember the testimony.

He admitted that he was a member of the committee that prepared the list of former employees that could be restored. Here is the list [exhibiting], and I wish to show how he passed on it in a moment.

Mr. Berney did not know of President Roosevelt's order which limited the reinstatement of these employees to January 30, 1934; and these were appointed in May. He did not know how many employees selected by him were Democrats or Republicans, or he said he did not know.

Senators talk about the civil service. Let me show how this man conducted the civil service insofar as he handled this matter.

My passing on them was specifically and definitely limited to pulling records and passing out information, with certain restrictions.

All these people in my State and every other State that we have any information about belong to one political party. Mr. Berney let no one on the other side get in, and he himself was not able to testify as to a single one who had gone in.

Mr. GLASS. If Mr. Berney was on both sides, how did he manage it?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know. I do not believe that he was on both sides, and I want to state why I do not so believe. I quote from his testimony again:

Senator McKELLAR. You said that you were not in politics.

He said he was away above anything political.

Mr. BERNEY. Yes, sir.
Senator McKELLAR. You take no interest in it?
Mr. BERNEY. No, sir.

And about that time a young man in the audience—there was quite an audience there—walked up to me and handed me a piece of paper which was not any larger than my two fingers, merely a little scrap of paper, and he immediately said he knew what that man was telling, and this occurred:

Senator McKELLAR. Is it not a fact that during the campaign of 1932 you bet on Hoover?
Mr. BERNEY. That is an unqualified misstatement. * * * I made no bets in the campaign except one—

Now listen to this:

I made no bets in the campaign except one, which was that if the Democratic Party were successful, in my judgment, the Republican money powers over the country would so handle things that the New York Stock Exchange would close. I bet one man in the service 10 to 5 that that would happen, and I collected the bet.
Senator McKELLAR. That if the Democrats won the stock exchange would close?
Mr. BERNEY. Yes, sir.
Senator McKELLAR. I thought you said you did not take any interest in politics.
Mr. BERNEY. I didn't say I don't take any interest in politics. I said that I was not qualified and am not qualified to vote either way.

He had just testified a moment previously that he did not take any interest in politics; he so testified twice. He goes on to say:

And I did not attempt to vote either way.
Senator McKELLAR. If a man takes enough interest in politics to bet on an election of any kind, he has some political views or opinions.

Mr. Berney replied:

I still say that it never affected any official action of mine.

He first said he did not take any interest in politics, and then, when confronted with the fact that all those whom he selected out of the numerous records which he said he had before him were Republicans, he testified that—

I still say that it never affected any official action of mine, but I still think that I have the right to visualize what may take place in different political campaigns, and I am sufficiently interested in American citizenship to do so.

Remember this was a Yale graduate whom we were examining.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in just a moment. I continue quoting from the testimony:

Senator McKELLAR. Were you a member of a political club known as "the Hoover-Curtis Club"?

I still had my memorandum in my hand.

Mr. BERNEY. I would say I was not. I can give you the story behind that.
Senator McKELLAR. I would be glad to have it.
Mr. BERNEY. Very well, sir. In, I believe, 1924, I was in the Veterans' Bureau, and I was invited by a subordinate of mine to attend a notification exercise for President Coolidge. I attended them. We got down to the place where they were held.
Senator McKELLAR. Where was that?
Mr. BERNEY. I believe it was Constitutional Hall. We got down there and were about to take our seats. The man I was with was

a member of the Sons of the American Revolution and other agencies of that kind in the District. Someone came to him and told him the man in charge of the door was not going to be there, and wanted him to take charge. He asked, "What does it require?" They said, "Well, we have a couple of marines to keep things in order." He said, "Mr. Berney is experienced more than I am in such things."

I do not know why he claimed that he took no interest in politics and had none, when his own friends said:

Mr. Berney is experienced more than I am in such things. Why not ask him to go to the door? I went to the door and organized these men at the Convention Hall, so that we could have order.

Senator McKELLAR. Of course, it was not the love of politics, but your love and loyalty to law and order that brought you to that Coolidge meeting in 1924.

Mr. BERNEY. It was my interest in the leader of this Nation at the time. I have had an interest in the person and I will say the personnel of the White House ever since I have been old enough to read and write.

Senator McKELLAR. But you never had enough interest to go to the trouble to vote for anybody for that office?

I digress long enough to say that all the testimony which is in the printed record shows that he lived about 100 miles away in Pennsylvania; that he was born and reared there, his family lived there, and he did not know what the politics of his father was, so he testifies; he did not know what the politics of his mother was. He said he took no interest in it, and they took no interest in such things, making a record for himself in the effort to show how carefully he disregarded politics in selecting 704 Republicans or 698 Republicans, whichever the number was.

When he was engaged on this mission of putting back employees contrary to the President's order, oh, he said, that he never had enough interest in politics to go a hundred miles in order to vote; he said he was not interested, did not have the money to go on election day, and that is the reason he did not vote; yet he was getting $6,000 a year and he would merely have to go a hundred miles. Resuming the reading of the testimony:

Senator McKELLAR. But you never had enough interest to go to the trouble to vote for anybody for that office?

Mr. BERNEY. If I could have afforded to go to Pennsylvania I would have.

Senator McKELLAR. You were getting $6,000 a year. Would not that permit you to go to Pennsylvania if you wanted to vote?

Mr. BERNEY. I have no residence there.

Senator McKELLAR. You can vote anywhere you please. You can vote in Maryland or Virginia. You can declare your residence there and vote. You never looked into that, but while you did not have enough interest to vote, you had enough interest in politics—or in law and order, not in politics—to be present at the Coolidge meeting and act as doorkeeper.

Mr. BERNEY. Senator, I would like to clear your mind on that.

Senator McKELLAR. It needs clearing very much.

Mr. BERNEY. Nothing would please me better than to be able to tell you, while I am under oath, that I am a member of one of the two great parties. Nothing would please me better. I wish that I could tell you that. I want to clear up my position as to that situation.

Senator McKELLAR. All right.

Mr. BERNEY. Sometime later I was amazed one day to open a letter in which I found a check for $5 for my services signed by somebody who was in Chicago, very likely a member of one of the committees.

Senator McKELLAR. You mean the Republican Committee, do you not?

Mr. BERNEY. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You did not take that check?

Mr. BERNEY. I took that check and endorsed it back to the man who wrote it and returned it.

Why did he endorse the check which he returned? Remember that little memorandum was still in my hand, and he did not know what I had. I knew he had endorsed that check. Of course, it is not material except bearing upon the truthfulness of this man.

Mr. BERNEY. I took that check and endorsed it back to the man who wrote it and returned it.

Senator McKELLAR. You regarded practical politics as so debased and low that you had to send it back?

Mr. BERNEY. I did not regard it as debased or low or loathsome in the least. I regard it as a very fine proposition. It means as much to me as the citizenship of Rome meant to a Roman.

Senator McKELLAR. Go ahead. I thought you were through.

Mr. BERNEY. Not quite. In the next campaign I received a letter, the same as I received letters from the American Legion, of which I am not a member, and other agencies for contributions. I received a letter saying substantially that in Washington there was but one place established where people could vote, and to keep that place up they were asking for a donation of $5 or $10—

My recollection is he said it was $50 before the committee, but it is changed here—

as the case may have been, I don't remember which. I sent a contribution for that purpose.

Senator McKELLAR. To the Republican organization?

Mr. BERNEY. To a Presidential organization.

Senator McKELLAR. It was Republican, was it not?

Mr. BERNEY. I don't know. It had been questioned very seriously whether Mr. Hoover was a Republican or not.

Senator McKELLAR. It was a Hoover organization?

Mr. BERNEY. Yes.

And again he testified that he had done the same thing the following year.

Senator McKELLAR. As I understand it, you were doorkeeper at a Republican meeting in this city in 1924?

Mr. BERNEY. It was not a Republican meeting.

Senator McKELLAR. I would suppose that it was, if it was for Mr. Coolidge.

Mr. BERNEY. It was a notification exercise.

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Coolidge was a good Republican. And you say that you contributed to the campaign of Mr. Hoover in 1928, and contributed again to the campaign of Mr. Hoover in 1932.

Mr. BERNEY. But my contribution was for the purpose of establishing these booths for these men and women to vote.

Senator McKELLAR. In other words, you helped Mr. Hoover's cause in 1928, the first time he ran, when he was elected; and in the same way you helped Mr. Hoover's cause in 1932 when he happened to be defeated?

Mr. BERNEY. I have given the facts, and you can draw your own conclusion.

This was the man who selected the 704 employees in violation of the President's order and put them back in the civil service without regard to the provision which requires civil-service employees to be called in the order of their standing on examination. It was a flagrant abuse of the civil-service laws. Talk about the amendment being against civil service! The amendment I have offered stands by the civil service. I cannot say that I agree with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], able though he is.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Can the Senator tell me when these men were first put on the civil-service list?

Mr. McKELLAR. They were appointed under President Hoover's administration, I believe, sometime early in that administration.

Mr. HALE. They qualified at that time, did they not?

Mr. McKELLAR. They qualified after being put on the list. They were put on as official appointees. I think 26 of them came from my State.

Mr. HALE. They passed the examination which was given them, did they not?

Mr. McKELLAR. They passed some sort of an examination.

Mr. HALE. They were on the civil-service list, were they not?

Mr. McKELLAR. In that way. They were put in the service that way.

Mr. HALE. They were on the civil-service list, were they not?

Mr. McKELLAR. They were put on, but afterward they were separated from the service. When they were appointed the last time they were not on the civil-service list because they had been separated, and under the provisions of the Executive order they had no civil-service status.

Mr. HALE. Why did they not have a civil-service status? A man may be severed from the service, but he retains his civil-service status for sometime.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be true, but it was a fraudulent restoration by Mr. Berney and therefore these men had no real standing.

Mr. HALE. Clearly this is a case of the Senate interfering with existing Civil Service Commission lists. If this is permitted, and if an administration coming into power can set aside the civil-service lists set up during the previous

administration, it seems to me that the beginning of the end of the civil service is in sight.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is what happened: They were separated from the civil service, and Mr. Berney put these former employees back on the list. He did not put them on the list through the Civil Service. He picked out those he wanted to come back and then got an order from the Civil Service Commission, without telling the Civil Service Commissioners that the President had already separated these employees from the service. The Civil Service Commission did not know about it. They testified to that effect before our committee. They knew nothing about it, and certainly would not have restored men of the kind who were restored in this case.

Mr. HALE. These employees had been separated from the service, but they still retained their civil-service status.

Mr. McKELLAR. They lost their status of eligibility for reinstatement in the particular department. The President had taken it away from them. He has charge of such matters. By his action they lost their status. They could have been reinstated in some other department if they were properly prepared for such other work, but they were certainly not eligible for reinstatement in this particular Department. The Civil Service Commissioners swore they knew nothing in the world about the President's order separating them from the service.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether or not the amendment conforms to the recommendation by the President in Senate Document No. 10?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the President's message of June 10, 1933?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; it is.

Mr. McKELLAR. It does. The amendment conforms to it, but the people here were put back in the service in violation of that order of the President.

Mr. FLETCHER. The amendment conforms to that recommendation by the President?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the point I wanted to make.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the point is, I will say to the Senator from Florida that the President of the United States issued an Executive order giving all these employees an opportunity, up to a certain date involving a period of 4 months, to be transferred, after which date they were not to be transferred; but they were transferred after the date prescribed in violation of the Presidential order.

May I appeal to the Senator from Tennessee to let us vote on the question? It is a very simple proposition as to whether the Senate wants to pay these employees. The Secretary of the Treasury urges that they be paid. The committee unanimously agreed that they should be paid. That is involved in the amendment. The only other matter involved is whether individuals put on the roll in violation of an Executive order of the President shall be permitted to remain there willy-nilly or whether they shall be required to take an examination in order to remain there.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yield the floor in order that the Senate may have a vote.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRNES. I should like to know whether or not the vote by which the amendment was agreed to was reconsidered by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the vote was reconsidered.

Mr. BYRNES. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. I send it to the desk.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, was the proposal made by the Senator from South Carolina for reconsideration by unanimous consent of the Alcoholic Unit employees matter agreed to?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, on page 16, lines 6 to 25, and page 17, lines 1 to 19, was reconsidered and that amendment is now again under consideration. The Senator from South Carolina has offered an amendment to that amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 17, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the words "have passed an appropriate open competitive examination" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "pass an appropriate noncompetitive examination to be", so as to make the sentence read:

Provided further, That the employees, other than those heretofore designated may be retained by the Treasury Department, but those designated in the first provision hereof shall not be retained after May 15, 1935, by the Treasury Department unless they pass an appropriate noncompetitive examination to be held by the Civil Service Commission after June 1934 and, if retained, shall not be paid out of this appropriation or any other appropriation made by this act.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from South Carolina will be good enough to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum, in order that others interested may be here.

Mr. BYRNES. Very well.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Costigan	Lonergan	Robinson
Ashurst	Couzens	Long	Russell
Austin	Cutting	McAdoo	Schall
Bachman	Dickinson	McCarran	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Donahey	McGill	Sheppard
Barbour	Duffy	McKellar	Shipstead
Barkley	Fletcher	McNary	Smith
Bilbo	Frazier	Maloney	Steiwer
Black	George	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gerry	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Moore	Townsend
Bulkley	Glass	Murphy	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Murray	Truman
Burke	Guffey	Neely	Tydings
Byrd	Hale	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Clark	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh
Connally	King	Pope	Wheeler
Coolidge	La Follette	Radcliffe	
Copeland	Logan	Reynolds	

Mr. ROBINSON. I reannounce the absence of Senators as heretofore stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee or the Senator from Tennessee whether they will accept the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. GLASS. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I apologize for taking even a couple of minutes of the time of the Senate; but I wish definitely to aline myself with the speech of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], who now occupies the Chair. I had intended to say something on the subject, but his remarks were so clear and so concise, as is usual with him, that, in my judgment, he rendered it unnecessary for me to say anything, because nothing could be said that could emphasize his remarks. What he said was true.

I am not making an assault upon the civil service. I believe in the civil service; but when men are sent out to fight gangsters, and the lives of our fellow citizens depend upon the ability and capacity of an officer to shoot straight, I object to his being denied employment because he does not know who happened to be the last emperor of the western division of the Roman Empire.

It might seem as if the Senator from Nevada had rather indulged in overstatement as to some of the questions asked of those who were expected to enforce the law, but he did not overstate the questions or misinterpret them at all.

I wish definitely further to say that we are now engaged practically in a warfare with the underworld. A man may not be of service in fighting the underworld even if he can

readily say whether Mark Antony's speech actually overthrew the republic of Brutus and established the empire of Octavius Caesar. On such interesting subjects Senators ought to be informed, but it does not help the man who is fighting a gangster to be able readily to give an answer to such a question.

I repeat that I am not to be understood as not making an assault upon the Civil Service Commission in any sense. The Commission, as its present organization is set up, has done good work. I have learned a few things about it from the Senate.

For years I regarded the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] as a man very safe to follow, and without making a close examination of his so-called "rider" I voted for it. I apologize to the American people, I apologize to the Senate and all others interested, for the vote which I cast. It was unworthy of me. I believe I have the right to say that the Senator from Tennessee himself did not know what he was doing or he would not have done it. He is too able, too sagacious, too fair a man willfully to have done what he did. Only ignorance is his plea at the bar of public opinion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. Just let me finish.

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait one minute. I do not think——

Mr. ASHURST. Ignorance on that subject, I should have said. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has already done me such great injustice——

Mr. ASHURST. I have not done the Senator an injustice. If he says he has done this willfully, then he has done himself an injustice, because his rider came very near disrupting the whole law-enforcement program of the Government.

The able Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] says the Treasury Department violated the law in retaining these men. It was a question of violating a rider or allowing the whole Alcohol Tax Unit to fall into complete wreck and disrepair.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator does not desire to make a statement like that. When this rider was passed last year the Treasury Department first asked, according to my recollection, that they be given 3 months, and then that the time be increased to 4 months, and then to 5 months, so that they might have no trouble about securing the proper kind of employees; and that extension was granted. Everything they asked was granted; and then the Treasury Department ignored their own request and kept these men on the rolls.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is not going to involve me in a controversy, because upon so many occasions he has rendered service promotive of the strength and the perpetuity and the efficiency of government that I think he will be easily forgiven for this one wild, reckless act of his—and I take nothing back. Either a willful, deliberate desire to injure the Government or gross ignorance of what he was doing is the only excuse the Senator has; and I stand on that statement.

So, Mr. President, I wish to share my part of the responsibility and the wrong done, and share as much of the responsibility of other Senators as they feel is irksome for them to bear.

I wish further to have it known that I telephoned to the Attorney General and telephoned to the Treasury Department, when it became obvious that these employees were about to be dismissed and the Alcohol Tax Unit ruined, and told them I hoped they would have the courage, the foresight, and the nerve—if I may be pardoned that expression—to go ahead and keep these men employed, so that the Alcohol Tax Unit would not be wrecked.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, there was no necessity for violating the law. Had the Treasury Department obeyed the Executive order covering a period of 4 months of time in which they could have obeyed it, there would have been no necessity for violating the law.

Mr. ASHURST. I am not able to discuss that question with the Senator, more than to say that the Senator from Virginia in his opening statement said that the men who were dismissed were the innocent victims of somebody's wrong.

Mr. GLASS. I say now that they were innocent victims.

Mr. ASHURST. That is all I have to say.

Mr. McKELLAR. This bill makes it right.

Mr. GLASS. But the Senator said everything would have gone to pieces if the Treasury Department had not violated the law. The Treasury Department had no business violating the law. They could have proceeded in an orderly way by observing the law, and they did not do it.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator can quarrel about that with the Treasury Department, because he is a master at that.

Mr. GLASS. I do not care a continental about the matter one way or the other, except that I think these employees ought to be paid.

Mr. ASHURST. Before I yield the floor, I agree entirely with the last sentence of the Senator's remarks. They should be paid. Without compensation and without much hope of compensation they remained at their posts and gave an example to Senators, they gave an example to other public officials, which we may well emulate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, I desire to call up the amendment I sent to the desk awhile ago and have it disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 56, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$8,575,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$10,575,000." On page 56, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$7,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

$9,000,000 (of which $2,000,000 shall be available for the transportation of mail, including mail for island possessions and Territories of the United States, across the Pacific Ocean between California and China).

And on page 56, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "$7,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$9,000,000."

Mr. McADOO. Mr. President, this amendment merely increases from $7,000,000 to $9,000,000 the appropriation in the bill for foreign air mail service. The Postmaster General already has the power to call for bids for air mail service between foreign countries and the United States, and between the United States and its possessions.

We have the opportunity now to enter upon the greatest air conquest that is open in the world; that is, to establish an air line between the Pacific coast and the great empire of China, going by way of Honolulu, Guam, and Manila to Canton, China.

The purpose of the amendment is to give the Postmaster General the available means to carry out any contract he may see fit to make with a company which is willing to undertake to transport the mails across the Pacific upon such terms and conditions as may be fixed in the call for bids for that purpose.

I hope the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will accept the amendment.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I am not authorized by the committee to accept the amendment, but I am willing that the amendment shall go to conference, so far as I am individually concerned.

Mr. McADOO. I shall be glad if the Senator will permit the amendment to go to conference.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. McADOO. I yield.

Mr. KING. I recall that in some of the discussions at the last session of Congress, or perhaps the session before last, there was considerable evidence tending to show that some of the ships having contracts with the Government, and operating upon the Pacific Ocean between our country and the Orient, and between our country and South and Central America, were receiving subsidies, and that the subsidies which they received for one voyage would almost pay for the vessels which the companies had obtained, and they had

received loans from the Government at 1- or 1½-percent interest.

Mr. McADOO. The Senator is speaking of ocean steamships?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. McADOO. My amendment has to do with airships crossing the Pacific.

Mr. KING. Is the amendment limited to airships?

Mr. McADOO. Yes; the amendment is limited to airships, and the total amount to be appropriated is only $2,000,000. I think that we would stand in our own light if we did not encourage, to the extent at least of $2,000,000, the establishment of an air line that will bring China within 4 days of the Pacific coast of the United States.

Mr. KING. To say nothing of Japan.

Mr. McADOO. To say nothing of Japan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to be inserted on page 55.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 55, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$3,250,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$3,350,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say that the law now authorizes the payment of travel allowance to railway-mail employees up to $3 a day. Under the various economy provisions the payment of such travel allowance was limited by cutting down the appropriation. Travel pay has been restored, as I understand, to practically all other employees. The amendment which I propose adds $100,000 to the figure contained in the bill as it came from the House. It is a permissive appropriation, merely authorizing the restoration, if in the judgment of the Post Office Department it should seem wise, of the full allowance to railway-mail employees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, on page 20, line 24, I move to strike out the word "two." I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury stating that if the restriction imposed by this language should remain in the bill it would seriously interfere with the operations of the Coast Guard, and therefore I have moved that the word "two" be stricken out.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there was so much conversation in the Chamber that I was unable to hear what the amendment was.

Mr. GLASS. On page 20, line 24, in the language relating to "maintenance, repair, exchange, and operation of two motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes in the field", I propose to strike out the word "two." The Secretary of the Treasury has sent me a letter about the matter. Does the Senator desire to have the letter read?

Mr. McNARY. What is the amount involved?

Mr. GLASS. The amendment would not change the amount at all.

Mr. McNARY. In a word, what would it do?

Mr. GLASS. It would merely let the Coast Guard for this particular purpose use more than two automobiles.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk be authorized to correct the totals in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] desires to offer an amendment to be inserted at the appropriate place.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

For the establishment, equipment, and maintenance of an assay office at Helena, Mont., $22,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I am not only not authorized by the committee to accept this amendment, but I may say that it took us 15 years to disestablish these assay offices, and the committee has been utterly opposed to a resumption of them, so I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the office for which I ask an appropriation is authorized by law and was in existence for 60 years prior to its elimination. During recent years there has been great interest in the development of mining in our State, and it is in the interest of the welfare of the small miners that we ask for this appropriation. At the present time the miners have to go a great distance in order to reach an assay office, and it is important that this amendment should be agreed to, to aid these small operators. The Helena office is authorized by law, the appropriation asked for is small, and the renewed operation of the office would be of great benefit and advantage in aiding and encouraging the development of the small mines in Montana at this time. In recent years there has been great activity in the mining of gold and silver.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I concede that the appropriation is authorized by law. There has not been an appropriation for this purpose for 5 years, and it took us 15 years to get rid of these assay offices, the overhead of which was infinitely in excess of the benefit derived from their operation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Government is now undertaking a policy of encouraging the development of these small mines. A bill will shortly be introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. POPE] which will propose to appropriate a large sum of money for the purpose of encouraging the operation and development of small mines. The Government has also indicated its desire along these lines in other ways, such as loans to mining companies by the R. F. C., and it seems to me that a small appropriation of $22,000, which will be of such great benefit to the small miners in our section of the country and which will tend to greatly develop new wealth, should not be objected to. Will not the Senator from Virginia permit this amendment to go to conference?

Mr. GLASS. I will let it go to conference, but the Senator may be assured that it will be stricken out in conference. I will let it go to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Virginia, on page 57, of the bill, to the following provision:

Foreign Mail Service, Merchant Marine Act: For transportation of foreign mails under contracts authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 861–889; Supp. VII, title 46, secs. 886–891x), including the cost of advertising in connection with the award of contracts authorized by said act, $28,850,000: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be paid on contract no. 56 to the Seatrain Co.

As the Senator from Virginia knows, there has been a great dispute about these several contracts, and I think there ought to be an amendment submitting them to the Comptroller General. I had prepared an amendment, and had it here on my desk, but it has been mislaid. I think it should probably be to this effect, "*Provided*, That no part of the appropriation herein made shall be used to pay any contract which the Comptroller General, after an examina-

tion and the hearing of testimony, shall determine to be either illegal or invalid."

Mr. GLASS. No money can be paid on a contract if the Comptroller General decides it is illegal.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that, but this would present the contracts to the Comptroller General for an opinion by him.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator would accomplish his purpose by the mere addition of the words at the end of the sentence, "unless approved by the Comptroller General."

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. On page 57, line 10, I ask that language be inserted so that it would provide that "no money shall be paid on any of the foregoing contracts unless approved by the Comptroller General of the United States."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may not the amendment be reported by the clerk?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 57, line 10, after the word "company", to insert the words "unless approved by the Comptroller General of the United States."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let the amendment be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 57, line 10, after the word "Company", it is proposed to insert "unless approved by the Comptroller General of the United States."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon wish the floor?

Mr. McNARY. No, Mr. President.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, now that the heat of discussion has died down—I did not wish to make this interpolation at a time when there might have been any excited minds in the Chamber—now that we have an even atmosphere, would it not be well that at some point in the bill we insert an appropriation to be paid by someone to be selected from the Democratic side of the Chamber and someone to be selected from the Republican side of the Chamber, for research work designed to apprise us of what is the difference between a Democrat and a Republican? [Laughter.] We have so many inquiries and so much confusion, and so much bickering and hard feelings temporarily established, which are ended the moment people are brought to an understanding of what the facts are, that I feel it would be in the interest of the parties; and such innocent bystanders as myself, undertaking to remain with one party or the other, would like to know just what course they would have to pursue in order that they might have no attack made upon them that they were not of a certain party.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is that a threat or a promise, that the Senator is going to undertake to stay with one party or the other?

Mr. LONG. Well, in the case of the Senator from Wyoming it would be a threat.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I appreciate the facetiousness of my friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], but I am just apprised of a matter of more serious import than his facetiousness.

I never wish willfully to wound the feelings of a Senator. I am advised by Senators upon whose sagacity and judgment I may rely, that in the heat of debate a few moments ago with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] I had spoken improperly, and in a tone or a manner in which I should not have spoken.

Let me say, first, if a Senator should say to me that I was ignorant of what I was doing, that would be true in many instances. There is no Senator here who knows all that takes place in this Chamber. It is not possible for him to know all that takes place. I meant no reflection on the character or the mentality or the learning of the Senator from Tennessee.

I do not have to stand here and eulogize him. I think, among the industrious Senators, he is one of the most devoted to the public interest. Surely that Senator is very sensitive when he is hurt or takes offense when I say he was ignorant of what he did. I was ignorant of what I did. Is he, forsooth, of more tender feeling than am I?

Had I known what his amendment was, I never should have voted for it. I was ignorant of it.

Now, if the Senator from Tennessee feels that I have been ungenerous or unjust, I tender to him an apology. If he does not want to accept it, what I said originally stands. That is all I can do. Did the Senator from Tennessee deign to listen to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona, unfortunately, has so outraged my sense of what is right and proper to be said on the floor of the Senate, that I am frank to say that I did not listen to what he had to say, and I hope the country will not listen to what he had to say. The Senator made some very serious charges against me. If he is a gentleman, he will apologize for those charges; and if he is not a gentleman, he will not.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG. I desire to continue my speech.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Louisiana should permit me to interrupt him in order to clear up this matter. I think the Senator should do that.

Mr. LONG. No, Mr. President; I do not want to yield any more. I want to finish my speech.

Mr. GLASS. Let me suggest to the Senator from Louisiana, if I may, that he refer his question to the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am undertaking to state a parliamentary matter which I think will avoid a great deal of misunderstanding for the future. Our great trouble is in understanding what a Democrat and a Republican are supposed to do. During the past week I have gone over the lore of the two platforms. I find that both of us pledged ourselves to strict economy, and that all of us have voted against strict economy. I find that all of us pledged ourselves to enforcement of the Constitution and to a specific itemization of expenditures, and of course we have not done that.

I desire to say further that the remarks of my friends from Arizona and from Tennessee are well in order. We are operating here in an atmosphere of our own self-inflicted ignorance. We are constantly in an air of failing to know and to understand what we are supposed to do. I really believe we should have the parties' stands defined, and I really think that in order to avoid in the future such occurrences as we have just had it would be a good idea for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to insert a provision for a $10,000 appropriation, to be given half to each side of this Chamber, one-half to be spent by the Republicans and one-half to be spent by the Democrats, not to inform the country, because the country knows there is no difference, but to inform the Members of the Senate what is the difference between the Democrats and the Republicans, and what one is supposed to do and to say in order that he may not be taken for what he is not.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to say a word further, I do not wish to pursue anything which might be unpleasant to the Senate; but I think if a gentleman makes an assault, or does anything that is contrary to the proprieties, the highest duty he has is to try to make amends.

I thought I had made amends for the affront I had unintentionally offered the Senator from Tennessee, but the Senator did not hear my statement. I now ask the Official Reporter to read what I said; and if the Senator will deign to listen, he will see that I wish to do all I may to make amends. I will ask the Official Reporter to read what I said with reference to the Senator from Tennessee in my last statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Official Reporter will read, as requested.

The Official Reporter (Mr. Carlson) read as follows:

Mr. ASHURST. I appreciate the facetiousness of my friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], but I am just apprised of a matter of more serious import than his facetiousness.

I never wish willfully to wound the feelings of a Senator. I am advised by Senators, upon whose sagacity and judgment I may rely, that in the heat of debate a few moments ago with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] I had spoken improperly and in a tone or a manner in which I should not have spoken.

Let me say, first, if a Senator should say to me that I was ignorant of what I was doing, that would be true in many instances. There is no Senator here who knows all that takes place in this Chamber. It is not possible for him to know all that takes place. I meant no reflection on the character or the mentality or the learning of the Senator from Tennessee.

I do not have to stand here and eulogize him. I think, among the industrious Senators, he is one of the most devoted to the public interest. Surely that Senator is very sensitive when he is hurt or takes offense when I say he was ignorant of what he did. I was ignorant of what I did. Is he, forsooth, of more tender feeling than am I?

Had I known what his amendment was, I never should have voted for it. I was ignorant of it.

Now, if the Senator from Tennessee feels that I have been ungenerous or unjust, I tender to him an apology. If he does not want to accept it, what I said originally stands. That is all I can do. Did the Senator from Tennessee deign to listen to me?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am content to stand on that record. Having been told, I repeat, by Senators, upon whose judgment and sagacity I may rely, that I was unfair and ungenerous, I have done all that may be done. If my friend—and our friendship goes back many years—wishes to sever our friendship after I have tried to make him honorable amends, I am powerless.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not know how to construe the remarks of the Senator from Arizona. If it is an apology, of course, I should be delighted to accept an apology from a man who has made a mistake in what he said; but he does not say that he means that at all. He means to say, apparently, that what he did say in the first place was absolutely true, and repeats that it was absolutely true, and then says that if he hurt my feelings, he apologizes for it; otherwise, he does not. So I do not know how to construe it.

I know how to act, and I know how a man should act on the floor of the Senate. It is against the rules for one Senator to impute unworthy motives to another Senator; and the Senator from Arizona certainly imputed unworthy motives to me.

I think the Senator ought to make up his mind as to whether he wants to apologize for his unseemly, uncalled-for, and untrue language, or whether he does not want to do it.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I certainly do feel that I should——

Mr. MCKELLAR. If the Senator wants to apologize, let it stand that way.

Mr. ASHURST. All right. I do apologize——

Mr. MCKELLAR. I will accept it.

Mr. ASHURST. No, Mr. President; wait until I have finished.

Mr. MCKELLAR. If the Senator is going to do that, I am not going to have anything more to say.

Mr. ASHURST. I do apologize. If my language bears any construction that would charge the Senator with any improper conduct or lack of fidelity to the public welfare, I apologize. As to his being ignorant of what he did, I do not apologize.

I am through.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator is so ignorant about everything he deals with that it might well be left just where it is. I will think the question over.

Mr. COPELAND obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

Mr. GLASS. Let us pass the bill.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I think that amendment should be read by the clerk. I am somewhat confused as to the proper place at which it is to be inserted in the section.

Mr. MCKELLAR. If the Senator will indulge me for just a moment, I have been temporarily detoured, and I will now call his attention to the fact that if he and other Senators who are interested will look at page 57 they will find there a proviso reading:

That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be paid on contract no. 56 to the Seatrain Co.

Just after the figures "$28,850,000" preceding the proviso, I moved an amendment to insert, and it has been adopted, this language:

That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be paid on any contract which after examination by the Comptroller General is found to be invalid or illegal.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I am now more confused than originally. The language now does not read like that first proposed. I do not know anything about the purposes sought to be accomplished by the amendment. The Senator has made no statement.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, yes I did; but the Senator did not hear it, and there was so much confusion around that it is not surprising the Senator did not hear it. However, I will state that there are many of these contracts the legality of which has been questioned, and this amendment merely refers that question to the Comptroller General to examine into the facts and report thereon.

Mr. MCNARY. May I ask the Senator, was this language submitted to the committee?

Mr. MCKELLAR. No; it was not. It was an amendment offered by me, and the Senator from Virginia said, so far as he was concerned, he had no objection to taking it to conference.

Mr. MCNARY. I do not know what construction might be placed upon the language proposed; it has not been considered by the committee, and I suggest that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no; I think it is not.

Mr. MCNARY. It is subject to a point of order, I think, on the ground of being legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is a limitation on an appropriation and not subject to a point of order.

Mr. MCNARY. I am not asking the Senator to make the ruling. I will submit the question to the Chair.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am perfectly willing that the Chair should make the ruling. I understand that situation.

Mr. MCNARY. I submit that, in my opinion, the amendment conflicts with rule XVI of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair an amendment limiting an appropriation is always in order, but if coupled with any provision imposing a duty upon another officer of the Government it is in the nature of general legislation and is subject to a point of order.

Mr. GLASS. And the amendment does not necessarily involve a limitation on the appropriation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I will not appeal from the ruling of the Chair, because on some subsequent occasion I will discuss the contracts referred to and offer an amendment where it will be in order so that this matter may be passed on. As a matter of fact, we are paying out $28,000,000 a year to 41 contractors, 38 of whom have no legal contracts on which they should be paid; and it seems to me that situation ought to be corrected, in view of such a large sum being involved.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that in the Independent Offices Act of 1934 provision was made that, on 60 days' notice, the President of the United States could modify or cancel any existing contract if he found reason so to do, and that, where there was such cancelation, the President should determine the amount of damages, if any, and that money should be set aside to make payment. Then, if a steamboat owner or line should be dissatisfied recourse could be had to the Court of Claims. My contention is that we have sought in an orderly way to make the head of our Government responsible for

doing, if necessary, what the Senator from Tennessee proposes. I do not think it is fair for us, without having before us the testimony as to the guilt of an individual line or corporation, to take action. We have not such testimony. I suppose if there is such evidence it will be produced in due time, but my judgment is that we have temporarily closed the gate, so far as we are concerned, and have passed over to the President of the United States the ultimate decision regarding these matters of contract.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is one of the reasons, I may say to the Senator, why I am content to accept the ruling of the Chair. I am going to offer a resolution within a day or two providing that the Postmaster General shall be required to furnish the opinions which have been forwarded to the executive department on that subject, so that we may have them before us.

Mr. GLASS. Will not Senators defer the discussion, then, until that shall have been done?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from Oregon, did he make the point of order or was his suggestion in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McNARY. I asked for a further elucidation of the matter, and then I became confirmed in my view that the point of order was proper, and I insist upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GLASS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments to the bill just passed and ask for a conference with the House on the amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GLASS, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. McADOO, Mr. TRAMMELL, Mr. STEIWER, and Mr. NORBECK conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) making appropriations for relief purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, Mr. ARNOLD, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. TABER, and Mr. BACON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

REPEAL OF PUBLICITY SECTION OF REVENUE ACT OF 1934

Mr. HARRISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6359, being the bill to repeal the publicity provision of the income-tax law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the bill, but immediately after the bill shall have been laid before the Senate, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6359) to repeal certain provisions relating to publicity of certain statements of income, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance without amendment.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Barkley	Bulow	Connally
Ashurst	Bilbo	Burke	Coolidge
Austin	Black	Byrd	Copeland
Bachman	Bone	Byrnes	Costigan
Bankhead	Borah	Capper	Couzens
Barbour	Bulkley	Clark	Cutting
Dickinson	King	Murray	Smith
Donahey	La Follette	Neely	Steiwer
Duffy	Logan	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Fletcher	Lonergan	Norris	Thomas, Utah
Frazier	Long	O'Mahoney	Townsend
George	McAdoo	Pittman	Trammell
Gerry	McCarran	Pope	Truman
Gibson	McGill	Radcliffe	Tydings
Glass	McKellar	Reynolds	Vandenberg
Gore	McNary	Robinson	Van Nuys
Guffey	Maloney	Russell	Wagner
Hale	Metcalf	Schall	Walsh
Harrison	Minton	Schwellenbach	Wheeler
Hatch	Moore	Sheppard	
Hayden	Murphy	Shipstead	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing that the bill shall be passed, but I understand there is to be an amendment offered. However, before that is done I wish to make a brief statement explanatory of the bill.

The bill was recently passed in the House by a very large majority. It seeks to repeal the so-called "pink slip" provision of the Revenue Act of 1934. May I say to the Senate that in no way does it affect the old law with reference to publicity of income-tax returns.

It will be recalled that in the consideration of the last revenue bill practically the same provision which had been carried for many years was again included with reference to income-tax publicity, namely, that the President might under such rules and regulations as he prescribed, give publicity to income-tax returns. If the bill now before us should be enacted into law, the old law would remain in effect as it is. It would in no wise be affected by the repeal of the "pink slip" provision. The old law provides for publicity, as follows:

Returns are public records open to public inspection only upon order of the President under rules and regulations approved by him; open to inspection of the House Ways and Means Committee, Senate Finance Committee, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, or any other committee of Congress so authorized by concurrent resolution, when said committees are in executive session. Such committees may report to the House and Senate the result of their investigation and thus publicity can be secured.

The present law goes further and provides that income-tax returns shall be open to inspection of proper officers of States, who may have access to corporation returns; that stockholders of record owning 1 percent or more of the outstanding stock of any corporation may have access to corporate returns; and that the names of all persons making an income-tax return shall be made public in offices of collectors.

By Executive order of the President, dated December 13, 1932, individual returns are open to inspection of State offices in those States having an income-tax return or intangible-property-tax law.

Even though the bill should pass, which seeks to repeal that provision of the law enacted at the last session, commonly known as the "pink slip" provision, the old law would remain in effect as to the provisions to which I have just invited the attention of the Senate.

The "pink slip" provision, so called, was the outcome of a conference between the House and Senate. It will be recalled that when the last revenue bill was before the Senate an amendment was adopted, offered by either the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] or the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]—I have forgotten which; I know they both favored it. It proposed to give wide publicity to income-tax returns. The matter went to conference, and the "pink slip" provision was suggested in conference by the House conferees and finally adopted by the conference committee.

The Treasury Department officials took no part in the discussion of the publicity of income-tax returns. They took no part in the controversy before the committee as to the adoption of the "pink slip" provision in the present law. Indeed, neither the Treasury Department nor the administration took any part in the issue now before the Senate. I

have a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury. I called his attention to the proposal, and he wrote me as follows:

Responding to your letter of February 5, 1935, relating to publicity of certain information in income-tax returns, the position of the Treasury is that it will carry out both the law and the spirit of whatever policy the Congress deems wise in relation to this matter.

There is attached, for any convenience it may serve, a brief history of the legislation bearing on this question.

The matter is now before us.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question at that point?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish the Senator would read the memorandum of the history of the legislation. It would be information which all of us would like to have even though we may be acquainted with the history.

Mr. HARRISON. Before I have it read let me briefly call the attention of the Senate to a little of the history relating to the publicity of income-tax returns.

The Civil War income-tax legislation, which was enacted away back in the Civil War days, did not provide that income-tax returns should be made public. Nothing was said in the law with reference to the matter. Later such returns were made public by regulation of the Treasury Department. Then developed a sentiment in the Congress against making income-tax returns public, and in 1870 a provision of law was enacted prohibiting specifically the publicity of income-tax returns.

The matter went on through the years and in the act of 1924 a provision was incorporated making public the name, address, and amount of the tax. That remained in effect for 2 years. Sentiment against it grew in the Congress and it was repealed in February 1926, in the revenue act of that year.

In 1932 there was no substantial change affecting the law of 1926. I believe it had been provided that any committee of Congress might call for the income-tax returns, and we broadened it slightly to include the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. In 1934 there was no change in any degree made in the old law, except that the Senate adopted a publicity provision and the conferees adopted the compromise provision which came to be known as the "pink slip" provision. The "pink slip" provision provides for information to be made public as follows: Name and address, full gross income, total deductions, net income, total credits against net income for purpose of normal tax, and the tax payable.

That, in brief, is the history of income-tax publicity. I now send to the desk the memorandum attached to the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, addressed to the Chairman of the Finance Committee, and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

HISTORY OF SECTION 55 (B), REVENUE ACT OF 1934

Section 55 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1934 reads as follows:

"Every person required to file an income return shall file with his return, upon a form prescribed by the Commissioner, a correct statement of the following items shown upon the return: (1) Name and address, (2) total gross income, (3) total deduction, (4) net income, (5) total credits against net income for purposes of normal tax, and (6) tax payable. In case of any failure to file with the return the statement required by this subsection, the collector shall prepare it from the return, and $5 shall be added to the tax. The amount so added to the tax shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner as amounts added under section 291. Such statements or copies thereof shall as soon as practicable be made available to public examination and inspection in such manner as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may determine, in the office of the collector with which they are filed, for a period of not less than 3 years from the date they are required to be filed."

Except for subsection (b), there is no substantial change in section 55 as respects publicity of income-tax returns over corresponding sections of prior revenue acts, beginning with the Revenue Act of 1926.

Subsection (b) was inserted in the Revenue Act of 1934 by the committee of conference (see conference report—H. Rept. 1385—re amendment no. 38, at pp. 4 and 19). There was no similar provision in the House bill 7835. However, the Senate did amend section 55, providing for publicity of returns. The amendment, as offered by Senator LA FOLLETTE and adopted by the Senate (see p. 6546 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 73d Cong.) provided:

"Returns made under this title upon which the tax has been determined by the Commissioner shall constitute public records and shall be open to public examination and inspection under rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary and approved by the President."

The action taken by the conferees appears to have been in the nature of a compromise, which does not give publicity to income returns, but provides for publicity of the statement required to be filed with the return, which statement gives information as to the following items taken from the return: (1) Name and address, (2) total gross income, (3) total deductions, (4) net income, (5) total credits against net income for purposes of normal tax, and (6) tax payable.

Under section 55 (b) the publicity of the statement required thereunder seems to be mandatory as far as the Treasury is concerned:

"* * * Such statements or copies thereof shall as soon as practicable be made available to public examination and inspection in such a manner as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may determine, in the office of the collector with which they are filed, for a period of not less than 3 years from the date they are required to be filed."

Pursuant to section 55 (b) of the act, Treasury Decision 4500 was approved (Internal Revenue Bull., vol. XIII, no. 51, p. 2), in which form 1094 was prescribed as the form for the statement required by such action. It was also provided therein:

"Within a reasonable time after the income return is filed, the statement on form 1094, or a copy thereof, under such procedure as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, shall be available for public examination and inspection in the office of the collector for the district in which the return and statement were filed."

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I have said about all I desire to say. I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has a substitute to offer for this proposal, and I imagine that will be the issue which will be presented to the Senate.

I may state that when the House passed on this question the vote in the House was 302 for repeal and 98 against repeal.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the bill before the Senate shall become law, will the able Senator from Mississippi state to the Senate, so far as he is able, what the procedure adopted under section 55, subdivision (a), is likely to be?

Mr. HARRISON. I have not the section before me; but that is the publicity provision of the law?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is the publicity provision of the law.

Mr. HARRISON. I can only say, as I stated in my preliminary remarks, that the President may make such rules and regulations with reference to publicity of income-tax returns as he desires; and that the Ways and Means Committee, the Finance Committee, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, or any other committee which may be appointed with reference to revenue matters, may get these income-tax returns. Whether or not the President of the United States would change the policy heretofore followed, and give publicity to the returns, I do not know.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 55 of the Revenue Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 55. Publicity of returns

"(a) Returns made under this title upon which the tax has been determined by the Commissioner shall constitute public records and shall be open to public examination and inspection under rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary and approved by the President. Whenever a return is open to the inspection of any person a certified copy thereof, shall, upon request, be furnished to any person under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. The Commissioner may prescribe a reasonable fee for furnishing such copy.

"(b) (1) The Secretary and any officer or employee of the Treasury Department, upon request from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Finance of the Senate, or a select committee of the Senate or House

specially authorized to investigate returns by a resolution of the Senate or House, or a joint committee so authorized by concurrent resolution, shall furnish such committee sitting in executive session with any data of any character contained in or shown by any return.

"(2) Any such committee shall have the right, acting directly as a committee, or by or through such examiners or agents as it may designate or appoint, to inspect any or all of the returns at such times and in such manner as it may determine.

"(3) Any relevant or useful information thus obtained may be submitted by the committee obtaining it to the Senate or the House, or to both the Senate and the House, as the case may be.

"(c) The proper officers of any State may, upon the request of the Governor thereof, have access to the returns of any person, or to an abstract thereof showing the name and income of any person, at such times and in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(d) The Commissioner shall as soon as practicable in each year cause to be prepared and made available to public inspection in such manner as he may determine, in the office of the collector in each internal-revenue district and in such other places as he may determine, lists containing the name and the post-office address of each person making an income-tax return in such district.

"(e) No person shall obtain, divulge, or circulate or offer to obtain, divulge, or circulate for compensation any information derived from an income-tax return: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not be construed to prohibit publication by any newspaper of information derived from income-tax returns for purposes of argument nor to prohibit any public speaker from referring to such information in any address. Any person violating any of the provisions of this subsection shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than $100 or more than $500, or by imprisonment for not less than 1 month or more than 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the question of whether or not income-tax returns should be made public records has been in controversy upon every revenue bill that has been considered since 1921. On three different occasions the Senate of the United States has gone on record in favor of making income-tax returns public records, just as all other records of the Government are public records.

Early in the history of the income tax—namely, in the sixties—the Government provided that tax returns should be public records. I desire to point out briefly the reaction of distinguished persons at the time it was proposed, following the Civil War, to revoke the policy then in effect of making the returns public records and to shroud them in secrecy.

In this connection I desire to read from an editorial in the New York Tribune of May 24, 1866, written by that distinguished publicist of his time, Horace Greeley:

The Evening Post has a Washington dispatch which says:

"The Committee on Ways and Means have agreed to an amendment of the tax bill providing that lists of income shall not be published nor furnished for publication, but they shall be open to private inspection at the office of the collector.

"We would like to believe this untrue. We believe that publicity given to the returns of income submitted by individuals to tax gatherers has already put millions of dollars in the Treasury and gone far toward equalizing the payments of the income tax by rogues with that of honest men and saved thousands from being imposed upon and swindled by false pretenses of solvency and wealth, made on purpose to incur debts preordained never to be paid. The knave who sought credit on assumption of wealth belied by their returns of incomes, of course, hate publicity given to those returns; but why should any honest man seek to pass for any more (or less) than he is worth?"

In another editorial on January 26, 1865, the New York Tribune said:

We learn that the publishing of the list of income-tax payers in this city, against which there has been so much absurd outcry, is likely to prove beneficial to the revenue as well as to the consciences of some of our "best citizens." Already, as we understand, considerable sums have been returned to the assessors and paid to the collectors by persons who have discovered "errors" in their original returns of incomes since the publication of the lists referred to, and assessors have received valuable information in reference to the incomes of some gentlemen who should but have not yet amended their returns.

Mr. President, these returns were matters of public record until 1871, when the fight to surround the returns with secrecy was finally successful. I grant that it is impossible, from the statistics available, to point out anything more than the indication of the effect of this change in policy upon revenue. But the fact remains that in 1871, when the returns were surrounded by secrecy, the number of returns, and presumably the amount of tax paid, decreased by more than 20 percent.

In 1870, when the returns were published, the number showing incomes over $2,000 were 94,887. In 1871, when publicity was prohibited, the number fell to 74,000—that is, from 94,000 to 74,000. In 1872 it fell to 72,000, and this in spite of the fact that, as shown by individual bank deposits, bank clearings, and so forth, 1871 and 1872 were more prosperous years than 1870.

Similarly, Mr. President, I should like to point out that in North Carolina, when the income-tax returns under the State law were published, the tax collections immediately more than doubled.

Wisconsin has had an income-tax law for a great many years. Prior to 1923 the income-tax returns in Wisconsin were surrounded by secrecy. In 1921 the legislature of the State, at a special session, authorized an audit of income-tax returns extending over the previous 6-year period, which included the years of lush profits incident to the war. This audit of back income-tax returns resulted in the collection of $3,500,000 of back taxes, which either fraudulently or erroneously had been withheld from payment in the State of Wisconsin.

As a result of these disclosures, in 1923 the State adopted a law very similar to the amendment which I have now proposed, making income-tax returns public records, and that law has remained upon the statute books during all administrations, whether they have been Progressive, reactionary, or Democratic, and no successful effort has ever been made to repeal the law.

It is true that in 1930 one of the commissioners, writing a report, made the statement which was quoted by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MURPHY], when we had this debate before, in which the commissioner expressed it as his opinion that the law had not resulted in any beneficial effect, but that, on the contrary, it had been subjected to some abuses.

In answer to that contention, I want first of all to read from the statement of Hon. Charles D. Rosa, who has been a member of the Wisconsin Tax Commission since 1921. During his service upon the commission the law has contained a secrecy feature, and since 1923 income-tax returns in the State of Wisconsin have been public records.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I have before me the quotation referred to by the Senator, and according to information given me, the statement referred to by the Senator was the report of the commission. Is that true?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It was the report of the commission written by Mr. Kelly, who served upon the commission only a short time, and has since retired, to become secretary of the Taxpayers' Alliance in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. COPELAND. But it was concurred in at the time by the commission, I assume.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not certain whether or not the commission is in the habit of filing minority reports, but I have in my hand a statement which has been made—and if the Senator will permit me, I should like to read it—by a member of the tax commission who was on the commission at the time when this report to which the Senator refers, and to which I have referred, was published. This communication states:

Cannot express myself too strongly in favor of publicity of income-tax returns; 14 years on the commission, 2 of them while a secrecy statute was in force, have convinced me that secrecy makes administrative bodies star chamber courts. Under secrecy, graft, racketeering, crookedness, favoritism, and incompetence can run riot without effective check. Publicity aids materially in effective administration and contributes in making the tax equitable and acceptable to a very large majority of taxpayers.

No reason can be advanced for secrecy of the processes imposing an income tax which cannot also with equal weight be advanced in favor of secrecy of the processes imposing any other

tax. To make all tax processes secret would mean that democracy has gone far in surrendering its most effective and salutary sovereign power.

I also wish to quote a statement recently made by Hon. Harold Groves, a professor of economics in the University of Wisconsin, and formerly a member of the Wisconsin Tax Commission:

Income-tax publicity enacted in Wisconsin in 1923 in my opinion has been an important aid to the honest administration of our State income tax. Important cases of dishonest administration have been exposed because of the publicity feature. People are entitled to know the facts of income, and Wisconsin income-tax information is legitimately used. Efforts to repeal the publicity clause have been defeated by the legislature whenever attempted. Publicity of returns, I believe, is an important reason for the clean and successful administration of the Wisconsin income-tax law.

I also want to read from the statement of Hon. W. J. Conway, at the present time chairman of the Wisconsin Tax Commission:

I am decidedly in favor of publicity on income-tax returns. Wisconsin, a pioneer in such legislation, has demonstrated from experience under publicity law, as well as secrecy law, that best results obtained under publicity law. Am convinced secrecy clause will never be restored here. Light of publicity strongly contributes to filing of honest returns. Recent disclosures before United States Senate committees indicate abuses of secrecy clauses. If publicity permitted to any extent, same should be carefully safeguarded in the public interest.

Mr. President, as I see it, this is a simple issue. In every instance, so far as any other tax is concerned, whether it be imposed by a local unit of government, by the county government, by the State government, or by a municipality, the returns are matters of public record. I venture to say that if there were any proposal advanced in any municipality, in any county, or in any State, to surround property-tax returns with a veil of secrecy, it would result in a feeling of moral indignation upon the part of the people of those respective localities and communities.

It is said that income-tax returns contain information not to be obtained from the property-tax returns. The moment a government determines to employ the income tax, the return of the individual is no longer a matter of private concern between an individual and his government; it is a matter of public concern, not only because it is necessary to make certain that the law is being properly enforced but it is also necessary in order that every citizen may know that every other citizen is carrying his share of the responsibility and the burden imposed under the tax.

I know that propaganda has been distributed concerning the repeal of the "pink slip" amendment, which, as the Senator from Mississippi acknowledged, was the product of the combined judgment of the conferees upon the last revenue bill, to the effect that income-tax returns, if they are public records, will be used by kidnapers and by those desiring to prepare "sucker" lists. I say that no such result has occurred in the State of Wisconsin, where income-tax returns have been public records since 1923.

There are wealthy citizens in the State of Wisconsin. There is a large number of taxpayers there who contribute a substantial amount of money under the Federal income-tax law to the Federal Government. There are large municipalities in our community. Mr. President, during all the years when income-tax returns have been matters of public record, there has not been a single instance to which any person can point where the income-tax return being a matter of public inspection has resulted in any of the disastrous things predicted by the enemies of making income-tax returns public records. For this reason, as I stated a few moments ago, it has never been possible under any administration in the State of Wisconsin to bring about a repeal of our law.

In Wisconsin we have a record, so far as crime, its prevention, and punishment are concerned, which I am willing to stack up against that of any other State of the Union. None of the things which have been predicted by the enemies of this proposal have taken place.

I wish to quote from a well-known tax authority on this subject, Prof. C. C. Plehn.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. The committee has not recommended a repeal of publicity. I am sure the Senator does not want to give the impression that if this resolution should be adopted we would be going back to old conditions. The proper use of the knowledge gained through the income-tax return would be available under the 1926 law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator well knows that the section in the 1926 act is entirely permissive, and that under its terms no President has ever acted. We have never had any rules and regulations issued for the inspection of income-tax returns, so that the Senator's statement that we have publicity in the law is not true. We have in the law of 1926, which has been continued in every act since that time, the permissive authority given to the Executive to issue rules and regulations under which returns may be made public.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator well remembers that when we had our last tariff hearings the Finance Committee had full access to the returns of corporations in order that the committee might know whether or not there was justification for such changes in the tariff as these various corporations desired. So under the law as it was there certainly was no interference with the passing on to the Senate of the material needed to form proper judgments in tariff making.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There are certain provisions in the statute—they are reincorporated in the amendment which I have offered—which give access to income-tax returns on the part of the Senate Finance Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and any specially authorized committee, to have access to this information, but certainly the Senator cannot contend that under the permissive authority extended in the first paragraph of section 55 of the Revenue Act of 1926 we have had any rules or regulations issued by the Chief Executive pursuant to that authority which have made income-tax returns public records or open to public inspection.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I have no particular objection to the Senator's amendment until we reach the bottom of page 3. My objection to his amendment lies in the material on page 4—

That this subsection shall not be construed to prohibit publication by any newspaper of information derived from income-tax returns for purposes of argument nor to prohibit any public speaker from referring to such information in any address.

That immediately takes so much away from the wholesome features of the Senator's amendment that it makes it just as offensive as the present law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the provision to which the Senator refers, if he will read the first sentence of it—

No person shall obtain, divulge, or circulate, or offer to obtain, divulge, or circulate for compensation any information derived from an income-tax return—

was incorporated in an effort to meet the fancied objections of some people that this information will be used commercially by individuals searching the returns for the purpose of preparing lists for credit organizations or for mail-order concerns. But, Mr. President, if the income-tax return is to be a public record, and if it is to be effective in its results in securing a more effective and honest administration of the law and the submission of returns which are more adequate then, of course, you cannot prohibit any public use of that information.

Mr. COPELAND. Well, of course, Mr. President, I desire to prohibit the public use of that information.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am aware of that fact.

Mr. COPELAND. That is the reason I object to the last part of the Senator's amendment. I think the part down to the bottom of page 3 where the Senator's amendment provides:

> No person shall obtain, divulge, or circulate, or offer to obtain, divulge, or circulate for compensation any information derived from an income-tax return—

is right, and that is done as the result of the experience in the Senator's own State where abuse has been practiced, and I take it the Senator, knowing that situation, included a provision to guard against it in his amendment. If his amendment had stopped at the bottom of page 3, I personally would have no objection to it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; but if the Senator precludes the use of this information at all, how can it serve in forcing a better administration and a more vigorous enforcement of the administration of the law? What benefit is to be obtained in compelling taxpayers to make out their returns with the full knowledge that if they resort to evasion or if they resort to devices designed to permit them to escape their fair share of the tax, that it will be exposed and made a matter of public record?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. To what extent does the Senator think that his conception of the utility of publicity would be served by permitting the free consultation of these records by all tax assessing and collecting officers, stopping at that point with the license? To what extent does the Senator think that would serve the publicity usefulness which he has in mind?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think, Mr. President, that it would be helpful to some extent. If, for instance, taxing officials of municipalities had access to the returns I think that it would be effective so far as helping them in the collection of taxes which are paid to the Federal Government, but which are avoided so far as the municipality is concerned. But I do not believe that it would achieve the result which I am confident would result from full publicity as the result of the experience that we have had in Wisconsin, and as the result of the experience which the Federal Government had back in the 70's, namely, to secure a larger return of the taxes due under the law.

I now desire to read from Prof. C. C. Plehn, a well-known authority on taxation:

> To a people unaccustomed to an income tax it may seem that one's income is a very intimate, personal, and private affair, and there is a natural dread of letting one's business rivals know one's business. But as a matter of fact the income-tax statement or return will be no more likely to be examined out of sheer curiosity or for purposes of gossip than are the property-tax returns, about which no such veil of secrecy is drawn; and the business rival generally has better information already than he could possibly obtain from the returns. Against such dark secrecy it may well be urged that it is very important to feel assured that all incomes, my neighbor's as well as mine, are fairly and truly assessed, a thing that can never be if the final assessments never see the light of day. Fear of publicity is a bogey man.

Mr. President, whenever there has been an investigation of the income-tax situation from a Federal point of view it has disclosed glaring evasions of tax and in some instances maladministration, which I contend were in large part made possible by the fact that the returns of the individual making them are kept secret, and also because those charged with the administration of the law knew that they were operating under a veil of secrecy.

I venture the assertion that the revelations which were produced by the special select committee of which the Senator from Michigan was chairman of the gross favoritism and maladministration in the income-tax unit of the Treasury would never have occurred had the income-tax returns been a matter of public record and open to inspection.

As a matter of fact, one of the first things that new employees of the Bureau are warned about is this provision providing secrecy over the income-tax returns. They are urged that in conformity with their oaths which they have taken they must observe this provision of the law. And it is emphasized to them.

Now, what is the position of a person in the income-tax unit of the Treasury who finds what seems to him to be a glaring evasion of the law or maladministration of it? If he cannot secure action by taking the matter up with his superiors, he is under the law guilty of a crime if he brings it to the attention of any Senator or any Representative, or if he attempts to bring it to the attention of the general public.

It cannot be denied, Mr. President, that surrounding the income-tax returns with the veil of secrecy predisposes to a maladministration of the law, to favoritism, and to a failure upon the part of some of the taxpayers properly to make out their returns. The investigation by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency revealed shocking conditions, and, in my opinion, many of the practices thus disclosed, involving evasion of the law, through devices which were, perhaps, in the strict letter of the law, legal, would never have been resorted to except under provisions whereby the individual taxpayer knew that his return was secret and that such secrecy would be protected by the Government.

There is one other aspect of the situation upon which I wish briefly to touch. We can never have in this country conviction in the public mind that the income-tax law is being adequately and vigorously administered or that all taxpayers are carrying their fair and proportionate share of the burden imposed under the income-tax law so long as the return is protected by the secrecy provision of the existing law. I doubt very much if Senators are fully aware of the shocking effect upon the public mind of the disclosures which Senate and House committees have made of conditions under the income-tax law. The average person paying a property tax knows full well that his neighbor, if he chooses to do so, may go to the tax assessor's office and examine the return which he has made; but when he becomes aware of the fact that men of great wealth in this country have found ways and means of avoiding their share of the income tax, when he knows that their returns are protected by the seal of secrecy, when he realizes that the individuals charged with public responsibility for auditing and passing upon tax returns are working under a requirement of secrecy, there has been prepared the soil for suspicion in the mind of the average citizen that persons with great economic power are not meeting their responsibilities under the law.

I realize it is only an assertion, since I cannot prove it, and I do not wish to overemphasize it, but the returns thus far received indicate a 33⅓-percent increase over such returns last year, and, while I grant that a large percentage of that increase is due to the changes which were made in the law and the efforts of the Congress and the department to close the loopholes, yet I venture the assertion that the fact that even partial publicity was provided in the compromise measure was a factor in increasing the amount of taxes paid under the present law.

No greater step could be taken for efficiency and honest administration and for a higher degree of responsibility upon the part of the taxpayer in making his return than to adopt the amendment which I have offered.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there may be printed in the RECORD the yea-and-nay vote which is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 13, 1934, upon an amendment similar to the one which I have now offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

(See Exhibit A.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin what the increase was, if any, in the income-tax collections following the repeal of the secrecy provision of the Wisconsin State income-tax law? I think the Senator made the statement that as of the year of repeal, or the year following—I am not sure which—a 6-year audit of the returns filed during that period was made.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; the Senator misunderstood me or else I misspoke myself. In 1921 the State legislature in

special session authorized an audit for 6 years prior to that time of income-tax returns in the State of Wisconsin. As the result of that audit, approximately $3,500,000 of additional taxes were collected. As I stated, the back taxes were assessed in instances where there had been understatements, or in instances where there had been fraudulent returns made. Following those revelations and the collection of the taxes in 1923, which would be 2 years after the audit was authorized, the State repealed the secrecy provision and made income-tax returns public records, open to public inspection.

I have no detailed figures to give the Senator as to what the returns were in 1922, 1923, or 1924; I can only refer him to the statements of members and former members of the tax commission, and which I have read and which express the opinion of those individual members of the commission that publicity has been very effective in securing better administration of the law and in securing more honest returns.

Mr. MURPHY. As I understood, one of the purposes of publicity was that it would increase income-tax collections. Hence my inquiry as to whether or not there was any increase following the inauguration of publicity in Wisconsin, but as to that the Senator says he is not able to give any figures.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. At present I can give only the information furnished by those who have been responsible for the administration of the law.

EXHIBIT A

Yea-and-nay vote on amendment of Mr. LA FOLLETTE providing publicity of income-tax returns proposed to House bill 7835. (From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Apr. 13, 1934, p. 6554)

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 34, as follows:

Yeas, 41—Adams, Ashurst, Bachman, Bone, Borah, Brown, Bulkley, Bulow, Capper, Caraway, Clark, Connally, Costigan, Couzens, Cutting, Dickinson, Dill, Duffy, Erickson, Frazier, George, Gore, Hatch, Hayden, Johnson, La Follette, Logan, Long, McKellar, Neely, Norris, Nye, O'Mahoney, Overton, Patterson, Pope, Reynolds, Robinson (Ind.), Sheppard, Shipstead, Thomas (Okla.).

Nays, 34—Bailey, Bankhead, Barbour, Barkley, Byrd, Byrnes, Carey, Coolidge, Copeland, Davis, Fess, Glass, Goldsborough, Hale, Harrison, Hastings, Hebert, Keyes, King, Lewis, Lonergan, McGill, McNary, Metcalf, Murphy, Schall, Smith, Steiwer, Thomas (Utah), Townsend, Vandenberg, Van Nuys, Wagner, Walsh.

Not voting, 21—Austin, Black, Dieterich, Fletcher, Gibson, Hatfield, Kean, McAdoo, McCarran, Norbeck, Pittman, Reed, Robinson (Ark.), Russell, Stephens, Thompson, Trammell, Tydings, Walcott, Wheeler, White.

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, facetiously, of course, the Chairman of the Finance Committee said to me a little while ago, "You got us into this discussion"——

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may call for a quorum?

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator from Vermont considers that important, I will yield; but I always hesitate to ask Senators to leave the tasks on which they are engaged.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think it is important, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the Senator from New York made the point of no quorum?

Mr. COPELAND. No; the suggestion was made by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I made the point of no quorum.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well. My attention was diverted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bulkley	Couzens	Gore
Ashurst	Bulow	Cutting	Guffey
Austin	Burke	Dickinson	Hale
Bachman	Byrd	Donahey	Harrison
Bankhead	Byrnes	Duffy	Hatch
Barbour	Capper	Fletcher	Hayden
Barkley	Clark	Frazier	King
Bilbo	Connally	George	La Follette
Black	Coolidge	Gerry	Logan
Bone	Copeland	Gibson	Lonergan
Borah	Costigan	Glass	Long
McAdoo	Murray	Robinson	Trammell
McCarran	Neely	Schall	Truman
McGill	Norbeck	Schwellenbach	Tydings
McKellar	Norris	Sheppard	Vandenberg
McNary	O'Mahoney	Shipstead	Van Nuys
Maloney	Pittman	Smith	Wagner
Metcalf	Pope	Steiwer	Walsh
Minton	Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Moore	Reynolds	Thomas, Utah	
Murphy	Russell	Townsend	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, a moment ago I spoke of a facetious remark of the chairman of the committee, who said that I had gotten the Senate into this discussion and I must help to end it.

It is rather interesting to notice the difference in speed in relation to a bill introduced in the House and a similar bill introduced in the Senate. I observe that the bill now before us was introduced in the House on the 4th of March. The same bill, introduced by me in the Senate on the 4th of February, received little official attention. That may be a warning that on our side we should be more energetic. It may be that our unlimited debate had something to do with the delay. I have never violently opposed unlimited debate, because I have indulged myself in that pleasure, a pastime that annoys the country, I fear.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that I have no particular objection to the proposal of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], except as regards the provision on the last page of his substitute. When I appeared before the Finance Committee to urge a report on my own bill—and I think I am divulging no secret in saying this—I was asked if I would be satisfied to go back to the language which was originally adopted by the Senate. My reply was that I would have no objection to it.

The language of the law which is offensive to some of us came out of conference, not having been voted or adopted on the floor of the Senate or on the floor of the House. The differences between the two Houses were such that they required a conference and a conference report. In this was incorporated the language which some of us believe should be eliminated.

I am sure no one of us who seek to have the "pink slip" provision repealed is in favor of absolute secrecy regarding income-tax returns. Certainly I have no such desire. I do not wish immunity to be given against the proper officers of the Government, or immunity on the part of those who make income-tax returns, permitting them to escape disclosure of the truth.

The argument that is ordinarily made in favor of publicity always relates to the big fellow, the big taxpayer. But it is getting quite difficult for him to evade the truth. It ought to be difficult for him to do so.

My appeal for the action proposed here has to do with the little fellow. It is just as much a matter of embarrassment to him—indeed, I think it is more embarrassing to him, because the skins of the modest people, the retiring people of our country, have not become so thickened as have the hides of the rich. My objection to the provision of the law now in force is the objection I have to its application to the rank and file of the country who are fortunate enough to make income-tax returns. With this group, as I see it, there is absolutely no reason in the world why their returns should be made public.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. I have just as much sympathy for the little fellow as has the Senator from New York, but I submit there are thousands and thousands of them who never make any return at all. If they have never made a return to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the agents of the Bureau do not seek them out; but, having once made a return, of course, the agents of the Bureau may go back to see why they do not make a return in some succeeding year. As a matter of fact, there are hundreds of thousands of the little

fellows to whom the Senator refers who have never made any income-tax return.

Mr. COPELAND. That is true; but I cannot for the life of me see what that has to do with this matter.

Mr. COUZENS. Oh, I think it has much to do with it. If it were apparent that anyone was avoiding payment of income taxes, application could be made under rules and regulations of the Treasury Department to ascertain whether or not he had made an adequate return. Not even Senators or Representatives can now get such information. No matter if my next-door neighbor or my uncle or my brother or somebody else fails to make an income-tax return, even though he may have a large income, there is no way to enable a Member of Congress to find out whether that person is evading the law.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me ask the Senator, how does this law help to get the facts?

Mr. COUZENS. Because under this provision a person could go and ask whether a return had been made. A Member of Congress could go, I could go, and find out, for good legislative reasons, whether somebody whom I knew to have an adequate income had made a proper return.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I dare say I am stupid about it, but I cannot see how giving publicity to returns that are made, will help in getting on the tax roll the man who has not made any return.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I see the position of the Senator from Michigan, but I do not believe the matter works quite as he describes it.

Take the condition of relief: Frequently persons come into my office and say that relief is not being administered properly; that persons who are not entitled to relief are on the rolls, and in some cases that persons who are on relief will not take positions if they can get them. My reply to them is, "Why do you not go into your community and report such people who are fraudulently on the relief roll?" They say they do not want to do that; they do not want to get mixed up in the matter. How in the world are we ever going to have relief cleaned up and have the income-tax situation cleaned up unless there is sufficient patriotic spirit in the communities to report fraudulent cases when they come to light?

I see what the Senator from Michigan is aiming at. My contention is that I do not believe what he is aiming at will be accomplished by the "pink slip" provision.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. COUZENS. I desire to say that I am not suggesting, by what I have said, that neighbors should snoop on each other. That is not what I am trying to get at.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly not.

Mr. COUZENS. Yet that is what the Senator from Maryland implies by his statement with respect to relief. In other words, individuals do not wish to snoop on their neighbors, and I am not even suggesting that, but I submit that if a public official desires to do his duty, wishes to see the law enforced, wishes to see equity between taxpayers, and wishes to go to the Bureau of Internal Revenue and see whether adequate tax returns have been made, he ought to have the right to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think a Member of the Senate or the House should have that right. I should have no objection to that. What I am complaining about, however, is that under the "pink slip" law everybody can examine these slips, and I do not believe 99 percent of the people would take the trouble to tell if they thought someone was making a fraudulent return, anyhow. The cases where a man would say something about his neighbor would be very, very rare, because he might be afraid there were circumstances which he did not know.

I see the Senator's purpose, and I take no issue with him on that, but I do not believe the "pink slip" law will work that way, and I use relief as an illustration. The only point I am making is that where a fraud does occur a man will not report his neighbors. Therefore, if fraud occurs in income-tax returns, I do not believe he will report his neighbors in such cases.

Mr. COUZENS. If the Senator from New York will yield further, I am not even suggesting that. I never was a prohibitionist. I was violently opposed to prohibition. I never approved of the snooping in prohibition, and I am not even suggesting that that would occur in the case of this law; but I do contend that when these records are available to public officials in every way there will be more integrity and honesty in filing returns and less means of tax avoidance adopted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I did not understand the Senator. I understood the Senator to be taking the position that the tax returns were to be open to everybody. Now I understand his position to be that they are to be open only to public officials.

Mr. COUZENS. No; I do not want the Senator to misunderstand me. I want them to be public records, the same as a man's tax records are public in the municipality where his property is assessed, where there is a personal-tax assessment against his family jewelry, his furniture, his home. They are all matters of public record now in the States and municipalities. I can go into Maryland and find out what every man is assessed for in his local community. There is no secrecy about it, and I do not know of any snooping that goes on about it. During all the time I served as mayor of Detroit not a single citizen ever came in and told me that his neighbor was underassessed, and I do not believe that will happen under the present law; but I do believe it is a perfectly logical conclusion that when taxpayers know these records are open for inspection there will be less trickery and less tax avoidance in making returns.

Mr. TYDINGS. Perhaps we might amend the law so as to allow the records to be open to the inspection of duly certified public officials; but without taking any issue on what the Senator desires to accomplish, I very much question that having the "pink slips" open to everybody who wants to inspect them will result in uncovering very much, if any, fraud or will result in the collection of any more taxes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me since he has yielded to others?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The disappointing thing about this matter is that the administration will sit here and allow something to be done away with that has prevented more fraud than any other single act that has been done. Those outside of Congress who want this provision repealed are chiefly the men who are making big money, who always have made big money, and who will continue to make big money, but who are paying infinitesimal income taxes, as Morgan was found to be doing as a result of the investigation of the Banking and Currency Committee. One of the main things to which the present heavy increase in income-tax payments can be attributed is the publicity now provided for. The thing ought to be absolutely open. There is no more reason why income-tax returns should be hidden than why any personal-property tax returns should be hidden.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if Senators do not mind, I should like to make my little speech and then I will yield to everybody. [Laughter.]

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] on occasions is right, but this time he is wrong. If he will look at his mail—and I know he gets more mail than any other human being in the United States—he will find that these protests against the "pink slip" provision are not coming from the big fellow; they are coming from the little people who have small incomes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me if I say about five words to him?

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

Mr. LONG. I do not get any protests. The big birds do not write protests to me. They know that would not do any good. [Laughter.]

Mr. COPELAND. Well, since I live in New York, I suppose they would write to me; but they have not done so.

Mr. President, I was much interested in what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] said; and, repeating what I said before, I have no objection at all to the language of the law as it originally passed the Senate, and which the Senator from Wisconsin has included in his amendment, that the proper officers of the States, etc., may have access to the returns. That is all right. I do not object to that. I do not want anybody who ought to pay taxes to be able to evade paying taxes. I do not want anybody who is now off the tax roll, who ought to be there, to be able to escape the payment of taxes. It is not fair to the rest of us.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator if he knows of a single individual in his State or in any other State who has complained of being actually injured by the present law. I have not found a single case of the kind in my State. When persons have written me on the subject I have asked them, in my reply, if they have been injured by the present law—not some other law, but the present law—and I have not received any information on the subject.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield to me, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he knows of a single instance where the "pink slip" or any other publicity provision has actually accomplished any good.

Mr. McKELLAR. One thing has happened: I saw the statement in a newspaper—I cannot vouch for it except upon the authority of the newspaper which printed it—that our income-tax receipts this year are 43 percent greater than they were last year.

Mr. GEORGE. Our tax receipts are greater, and that fact is due to some increase in business, but particularly to an increase in the tax rate.

Mr. McKELLAR. There has been some increase in the tax rate, but I do not think it accounts for an increase of 43 percent. Unless the present plan of publicity is hurting somebody, unless it is working to the detriment of taxpayers and wronging them, I do not see why we should repeal it.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it not much sounder, Mr. President, to ask whether it is doing any good; and if it is not doing any good, why should we molest the citizen?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is one thing sure: Our receipts of income taxes are greater than they were last year.

Mr. GEORGE. I have explained that.

Mr. McKELLAR. And that would have to be gainsaid in some way.

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly the Senator from Tennessee does not argue that the increase in our income-tax returns is due to the "pink slip."

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not arguing that; but I am saying that, in my judgment, the publicity has increased the amount of income taxes we have received.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if I believed that this provision of law has been responsible for vastly increased incomes, I would vote for a "pink slip" and a "green slip" and a "yellow slip" and a "purple slip." I would vote for every kind of a colored slip if that would bring us more money; but, with all kindness, I say it seems to me absurd to think that the "pink slip" had anything to do with the increase in the income-tax payments.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

Mr. COUZENS. I think it is undeniable that the law enacted in April 1934 has brought in more taxes. When the law was passed there was no mention of a "pink slip." That has just become a byword for section 55 (b) of the law; but the Senator knows that before the returns were made there was publicity all over the Nation with respect to these figures being disclosed as a matter of public record, and I venture to say that millions of dollars of taxes came in as a result of this so-called "publicity."

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will examine the tax returns of the ordinary taxpayers of moderate income, he will understand exactly where the increase has come. It has come in the increased rate.

Mr. COPELAND. Now, Mr. President, I will resume in my own right, although I concede at once that my speech has been much strengthened by the arguments presented by my fellow Senators.

We have heard a good deal today and at other times about hidden returns, and failure to get the truth about persons who ought to make returns. If the returns are not accurate, if there is an evasion of tax payments on the part of persons who ought to turn in funds to the Government, if there is a juggling of books or figures to justify a false return which is made, then if the facts are not found and the truth revealed, it is the fault of the officials of the Treasury.

I do not know what the experience of other Senators may be; it may be that I am viewed with suspicion by the Treasury, but there has not been a year, not one year, since the income-tax law has been on the books, when an inspector of the Treasury has not come to my office to go over my books. I assume he has come to find out, so far as he could, the truth about my income. Frankly, in my own case, I have always thought it was a terrible waste of money. I have not believed that the income I receive justifies the expenditure of so much money on departmental experts; but they have come. Sometimes an inspector will stay 3 days. He goes over my ledger, my day book, my check book, and over my receipts for bills paid—because I occasionally pay some. He has every opportunity to discover whether I have told the truth or not in my return, and I confess that it is always a moment of relief when I hear that he has given us a clean bill!

I assume it is the practice for such investigation to be made, and I do not resent it; I think it is perfectly proper. The instructions given to my office force are these, "Give them everything they want. Put aside everything else and give attention to this matter in hand."

If there is a failure of the laws, which have been improved since we first started the collection of income taxes, if there are those who are evading the payment of proper taxes, if the facts are not disclosed, it is the fault of the Treasury. At least they have every opportunity to find the truth.

I do not believe it will ever be possible to make people good or moral by law. There will always be evasion; there will always be dishonesty. But so far as machinery of government can do it, I judge that we are getting now pretty near the truth, although I do not say we did before we passed our stringent laws.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator says there will always be evasion; that there will always be dishonest people. If that be true—and I think it is, and everybody will admit it—is not provision for secrecy of income-tax returns one of the best ways on earth to permit those dishonest people, those evasionists, to evade the law?

Mr. COPELAND. I am willing to go certainly as far as the Senate did when it discussed this matter before. I would go even further than that. I would be willing to take the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin clear down to the bottom of page 3, which includes other things than those included in our original Senate proposal. This provides that—

> All bona fide shareholders of record owning 1 percent or more of the outstanding stock of any corporation shall, upon making request of the Commissioner, be allowed to examine the annual income returns of such corporation and of its subsidiaries.

I do not object to that in the slightest. In all good conscience I could vote for the amendment of the Senator from

Wisconsin through the first three pages. But when we come to the last page I could not vote for that, because, access having been given to the State officials, having been given to the shareholders of record, it upsets everything by going on to provide:

That this subsection shall not be construed to prohibit publication by any newspaper of information derived from income-tax returns for purposes of argument nor to prohibit any public speaker from referring to such information in any address.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is willing for the whole substitute to go into the law, and the publicity provided for in it afforded, but in effect, I think, by objecting to the sentence he has just read, the Senator indicates he does not want anybody to say anything about it. In other words, "You can look at this return, but you must not discuss it." A newspaper in a publication or a person delivering an address would not have any right to argue the returns, or what was claimed to be fraud. A newspaper could not call attention to it in its editorial columns. In other words, "You can look at it, but you must not tell anybody."

Mr. COPELAND. This language would make it possible for the editor of a paper to say, "Confirmatory of the statement we have just made, we refer you to the fact that George Norris paid so much, his total income was so much, and his expenditures were so much," or "Walter George had a certain income."

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is talking about the "pink slip."

Mr. COPELAND. I am talking about the "pink slip."

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator does not like it. The way to get away from the "pink slip" is to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, and we will not have any "pink slip."

Mr. COPELAND. I am not going to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin if this language on page 4 is included, because then we would have exactly the same evil we have in connection with the "pink slip."

One can go into my native village and find there perhaps the widow of a doctor, who possibly receives in income a trifle in excess of the limit, and, therefore, she has to make an income-tax return. What advantage is there to my old neighbors to know that Mrs. So-and-so pays $3.50 or $10 income tax? What good will come from that? I cannot see any at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the practical working of it would be that nobody would care about Mrs. So-and-so paying $3.50. The theory of those who object to this substitute, which the Senator seems to like pretty well because it would do away with the "pink slip", is that everybody is going to look into everybody else's income-tax return. They do not do that. They will not do it. But if secrecy is a good thing in income-tax returns, why not have secrecy as to all tax returns?

I could go now to the Senator's home town and find out how many automobiles he has, how many bonds he has, what salary he is getting. I can look at all that information; it is public. That has never hurt the Senator. I do not think it has hurt anybody. But what would be said if everybody who is to make tax returns should have them shrouded in secrecy, and nobody could look into the returns? We would not be able to see that this man or that man had committed fraud, it is true, because we would not know. But is it not known to everyone that secrecy in these cases always tends toward fraud?

Mr. COPELAND. I do not agree that such fraud is at all common. Mr. President, to be honest about it, I do not think that the public—and I refer to wide dissemination of the information—has any more business to have that information about Tom, Dick, and Harry than it has to come to me as a doctor and say, "Senator NORRIS was a patient of yours last week. Are you going to give publicity to what you treated him for?" Of course, in Senator NORRIS' case, there would be no objection, but there are plenty of citizens who would not want to have that information given by the doctor.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator is begging the question. He is entering into the discussion of a professional and confidential communication which has nothing to do with taxation. Does the Senator believe that all tax returns should be kept secret? That would keep the public from looking at them and prying into business.

Mr. COPELAND. I am not contending for that. I am perfectly willing that those persons who are entitled to know should know, but I am unwilling to have some neighborhood gossip dig up all the facts about the different persons in the community and babble about them all around town.

Mr. NORRIS. Have they been doing that?

Mr. COPELAND. They will do it if this "pink slip" provision remains in the law.

Mr. NORRIS. Why have they not done it about the return everyone has to make about his personal property?

Mr. COPELAND. Because the information has not been made so available.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes; it has.

Mr. COPELAND. No; it has not.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; it is available to everyone today.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well; but go into the office where it is available, and get the return of a man of affairs, and it will be found there are several pages of figures involved. There are few gossips in any community who would go in and study the return and gather the material, while, under the present plan, we would give him in a little prescription form the essential facts, which would be readily available. There is no doubt in my mind that there would be publicity in every newspaper, big and little, in this country, of all these returns. To what end?

What good would it do? There would be nothing accomplished in the world, except to give a catalog to every blackmailer and kidnaper, and every thief and confidence man, and race-track tout and compilers of "sucker lists" and high-pressure salesmen, and conscienceless solicitors and ruthless competitors. That is what would happen.

I am not interested in J. P. Morgan or in Andrew W. Mellon. I do not care whether their income taxes are published on the moving-picture screen. But I do not think that the vast majority of people who make returns which they are entitled to have moderately secret, should have them made public. If there were given over to the public a list of individuals in any community of the small income taxpayers, for these conscienceless persons who seek knowledge about what house to rob, or whether to indulge in a kidnaping or some other crime, there is a ready-made catalog of prospective victims. I disapprove of it positively.

Mr. President, I notice that the Senator from Wisconsin in his able address spoke along that line. Certainly there can be no doubt that many a man now who is struggling to keep his head up above water, who is hard hit because of the depression, who has had to use up his capital in paying wages, keeping his plant or his shop or his store in operation, is going to be embarrassed by this procedure. His creditors will examine his income-tax return, and frighten him perhaps into payment of debts that he ought not to pay in full at the time, and perhaps force him into bankruptcy. We work all these hardships in order that there may be full returns of the income of every man and woman in this country who is fortunate enough to have $13 more than the limit. I can see no possible advantage in it.

I am glad the Senator from Wisconsin referred to another matter and included in his amendment a prohibition on the bottom of page 3 to the effect that—

No person shall obtain, divulge, or circulate, or offer to obtain, divulge, or circulate for compensation any information derived from an income-tax return.

I am glad he did that, because in his State there was set up an organization which sent out a letter, of which I have here a photostatic copy.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. DUFFY. I have one of the originals if the Senator would like to see it.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator. I am much obliged to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. DUFFY]. Here is the original, of which I have a photostatic copy. This is written from Madison, Wis., and I suppose widely circulated:

> Government and business leaders have joined in announcing a decided upturn in business during the past year, and are now declaring that the process of economic recovery is rapidly going forward. Are they correct in those statements, or are they merely indulging in the well-known "professional optimism" which has come to be associated with their declarations along this line? Every business man should be vitally interested in this question, and should find out, if he can, whether or not his competitors are forging ahead at his expense, grabbing the lion's share of this much-advertised business recovery.
>
> For the fee of $2 per report copied, I will send to you copies of the income-tax returns of any business or individual in Wisconsin, so that you may check for yourself the position which your company is maintaining in its field. All orders will be held strictly confidential.
>
> Income-tax reports are now being received and are rapidly being filed away at the tax commission's office, where they will be open for inspection approximately by May 1. If you wish to engage my services in this matter, please send me immediately the list of all the reports which you will want copied. Thus, if reports are open to inspection earlier than I anticipate, I will be able to more promptly fill your order.

No wonder the senior Senator from Wisconsin proposes a prohibition against that sort of rascality.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, what is the date of that letter, if I may ask?

Mr. COPELAND. My copy is dated March 11, 1935.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In my opinion, that is in violation of the Wisconsin law.

Mr. COPELAND. Well, I hope it is, and I hope the man who wrote the letter will be sent to jail for 40 years.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. At any rate, it would be a violation of the pending amendment now offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; that is true.

Mr. NORRIS. We should not permit anything of that kind.

Mr. COPELAND. That is the reason I said I favored everything to the bottom of the third page. To that extent there is nothing in the first three pages of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to which I object.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why should not a man get that information and sell it to whomever he wants to sell it to? Is it not public information? Could he not go to the property-tax books and say: "I have the assessment of everybody in my county on real estate. Would you not like to have it? I will sell it for so much a copy." Why should there be any distinction between income taxes and other kinds of taxes?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to the Senator from Maryland that so far as I can see I do not see any objection to it.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is right.

Mr. NORRIS. But that provision is put into the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to lessen some of the fears of those people who are afraid that something of that kind might happen. If I had my say I would not have that provision in the amendment. I think such information would not hurt anyone. The same thing can be obtained now, virtually. One can go into Wisconsin, or some State which has no income tax, like my own, for instance, and can write the same thing about every man's property, whether he made an income-tax return or not would not make any difference. One can get information as to what every taxpayer has given as the property upon which he is going to be taxed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska, because I am with him. If we are going to have publicity of income-tax returns there is no reason why that information should not be sold and handled just like publicity of any other kind of return. If we are going to make fish of one and flesh of the other, it strikes me that we are not logical.

The argument has been made that one can see any other kind of an assessment and any other kind of taxes, and one can publish anything in the world he wants to about those assessments and those taxes; so if we are going to have publicity of income-tax returns we ought not to draw any restrictions about them. We ought either to have it or not have it, and if we are going to have it we ought to have it all the way through.

The reason I am opposed to the publicity of returns, if the Senator from New York will yield for just a brief observation, is not that the Constitution prevents it but because of the philosophy of the Constitution in the fourth amendment, which reads as follows:

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue—

And so on. I do not agree with those on the other side, but they think it is all right for everybody to know everybody else's business. I do not believe that. I believe just as candidly and sincerely, I hope, as those who take the opposite view, that there are some things that a man is entitled to call his own business, and one of them is how much money he makes, and I do not think he ought to be forced to tell how much money he does make, or where he made it, or how much his expenses were. That is his business. If he does not pay the right amount of tax then it is the Government's business, after examining the returns, to go and get the remainder.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for what he has said. He has anticipated what I was about to remark. I had a copy of the Constitution in my hand at the time he rose. I share with the Senator the hope that what we are proposing to do is not a violation of the fourth amendment. But it is certainly, as he has said, a violation of the spirit of the fourth amendment. There ought to be some place in this world where a man is safe. The home is a man's castle, we have always heard, and he is entitled to a large degree of privacy.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would be just as logical, carrying out the philosophy of the "pink slip" amendment, to permit a neighbor to come in another man's house to see if that man was violating the law. Why not? Why, if the law is being violated, should not my neighbor be able to come, open the door, and go in and say, "I do not say that there is anything wrong, but I just want to see what is going on in here." If we keep on whittling away what few liberties we have there will not be any use of having any Government, because we will all be automatons, goose-stepping along.

Mr. COPELAND. And we do not want to be embarrassed in the way the Senator suggests.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Let me ask the Senator a question. I am legitimate this time.

Mr. COPELAND. Is this the first time?

Mr. LONG. Is it not a fact that this so-called "pink slip" was objected to by what we might call the conservative element, the home-defending element, we will call it, so that the Senator from Maryland will know what I am talking about.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator from Louisiana himself is going to be on the side of the home-defending element.

Mr. LONG. No; not on the "pink slip" matter. What I wish to ask is if it is not a fact that we had the open publicity on income-tax returns first, and then the so-called

"conservative" side came back and said, "The best thing we will do is not to allow this thing to be open, but we will give you this little "pink slip" information in lieu of the whole thing", and that is what really happened, is it not?

Mr. COPELAND. I think that is what happened.

Mr. LONG. The same element that favors the "pink slip" and keeping all the publicity down now wants to take away the "pink slip." We want it taken away too. I want the Senator from New York, who is an able Member of this body, and who can explain it if anybody can—and that means nobody can explain it—to tell me why we should make an exception and provide that we shall have publicity of all other tax returns and not have open publicity of income-tax returns?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further at that point?

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am opposed to it as a matter of principle. Let me say that my observation has been that the "pink slips" do not always disclose people who evade their income taxes. There are plenty of people who, with "pink slips" or without them, have evaded their income taxes and all the pink or red or green slips in the world will not bring that fact to light.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. What is the harm in letting the entire income-tax return be open for the public to inspect? What is the harm in letting everybody know what a man claims to deduct and what he claims to have earned? If every man's income is open, has he done more harm than if he makes a return of his physical property which he has accumulated during his lifetime?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want to be personal, but as long as the Senator from Louisiana has no compunction about the matter may I ask him what he made last year? [Laughter.]

Mr. NEELY. Also what he did with it! [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. I made as much money as I spent in the Printing Office and with the United States Government as postage.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator give us the exact figures? I am interested, because I know he gave a great deal to charity; he financed two or three football games and various other activities. I am wondering in what year he made this money that he spent so generously. If he does not object, I should like to ask him now about that.

Mr. LONG. I made about $25,000 last year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Was it exactly $25,000?

Mr. LONG. No; I do not think quite exactly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Could the Senator give us the exact figures?

Mr. LONG. I cannot give them exactly, but I shall make a return pretty soon and will give the Senator a copy of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's salary was only $9,000. I congratulate him on having such a large law business outside of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. I am giving the Senator that information because the Senator has requested it. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] wants to know what I did with it. In order to set a good example I will say that I spent it for brass bands, for football games, for drinks for my friends, and things of that kind. I got some good out of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for just another statement?

Mr. COPELAND. Just one.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would not pursue this inquiry, but the Senator from Louisiana is good natured, and he does not mind these things being known. May I ask him how he made his $25,000?

Mr. LONG. I made it principally by people not having the sense that I have, because they hired me for their lawyer. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. That is a fair answer, because the Senator said he made it out of his law practice. I want to congratulate him on being at least as good as a collector as he seems to be good as a lawyer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for an inquiry?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the Senator from Louisiana deduct from his gross income tax the amount he spent for liquor for his friends? Did he deduct that as a loss? [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. The Senator is about to ask a personal question. Does the Senator want himself excepted?

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not get the benefit of any of the liquor, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. No; but the Senator might have had some of it, because it was free.

There is no reason why anyone should be afraid to disclose his income tax. There is no one who wants to know about income taxes nearly as much as I do. I have given a frank answer offhand. Why should not I have an opportunity to know about the Senator from Maryland and about the Senator from Kentucky as well as people outside of the United States Senate? Why should anybody be afraid? Why should not he want it known? I should like to have the public know it. The public knows already whether I have a house and lot, or whether I have a farm, or a pair of mules. That is all disclosed on my property-tax return. Any man can see how much property and the value of the property I had on the first day of the year. I have yet to see why a man should want to prevent the publishing of income-tax returns when he is willing to publish property-tax returns that everybody can see.

I will tell the Senate the difference. Here is the simple difference. When we were investigating the House of Morgan and the House of Rockefeller it was disclosed that the instructions were that the officials were not to question any income-tax return which came in with the approval of the House of Morgan on it. We did not know that, but that was in the record. They did not want these things published for good reasons.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. COPELAND. No; not any further.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to ask a serious question this time.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there really any analogy between making public the process by which a man arrives at his net income for income-tax purposes and making public the record of a piece of property that cannot be concealed, no matter what one happens to do with it? If I own a farm, there it is. I cannot conceal it. I cannot hide it. If I own a hotel or office building or any other form of physical property, of course, I have to return it for assessment and it is a matter of public record because I cannot hide it away. But it might be different if I were required, by the county or State assessing officers undertaking to make me tell, to disclose by what process I accumulated the money with which I bought a house or a farm or an office building or a hotel. Is there really any legitimate analogy between the assessment of physical property which lies out on the surface of the earth, and the process by which I arrive at an income upon which I must pay an income tax?

Mr. COPELAND. I agree with the Senator that it is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. President, when we give publicity to income taxes, full publicity, I not alone reveal what I receive and the sources of my income, but I have to reveal how I spend that money. I have to reveal what I pay my clerks and how much to each one. I have to reveal a great many matters which are not mine exclusively. They relate to other persons.

In the next place there is no income possessor in this country who has any heart, who is not giving money to dependents, other than direct dependents. To give full publicity to the income tax means to advertise the poverty of dependents. Under the present law, I happen to know, if one gives money to a relative, if it is in excess of a certain amount and is to be taken as an exemption, that item has

to be included in the tax return. What business is it of the world what I do with my money in the way of charity? It is no one's business.

That is not like demanding of me that I record the value of my property. Charity of that kind is a matter of a man's own business. What I may do is strictly my own business.

Mr. President, I was going to refer to the spirit of the fourth amendment, but that has already been enlarged upon. Certainly it is the spirit of that amendment to protect the right of the people to be secure in their person, houses, papers, and affairs, against unreasonable searches and seizures. Certainly the wording of that amendment is in accord with the spirit of our Americanism.

I am not going to appeal for the action we seek, on any constitutional grounds, of course, but I am going to appeal on the ground of common decency. It is not decent to give publicity through these "pink slips", and let every community have this knowledge to gossip about and talk about. To permit it is serving no public interest.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will see fit to enact the bill which has passed the House. This action on our part will do away with a procedure which in my opinion is un-American and indecent, and which in no sense promotes the public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I thought there would be someone else to fill in; indeed, I had hoped we were not to vote on the amendment this afternoon. May I ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he is anxious to have the vote on his amendment taken this afternoon?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand there are several Senators who desire to speak on it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that I hardly think it possible for us to get to a vote this afternoon, because there are several Senators who want to speak on the bill. I have no desire to press it. I hope, however, that we can go on with the discussion until sometime after 5 o'clock.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in the few minutes the Senator from Mississippi may want the Senate to remain in session this afternoon, I wish to say that without any question the genius behind the effort to keep down publicity on income-tax returns comes from the makers of big money. They have been using the vehicle of the income-tax return for so many years to escape taxation that they have scores of experts engaged to figure out various ways by which they may avoid paying their income taxes.

For instance, Mr. Morgan, when he was testifying before the Committee on Banking and Currency, made the statement that he never had anything to do with making out his income-tax returns, and it developed that for a number of years Mr. Morgan had not paid any income tax at all.

The committee not only developed that Mr. Morgan had not paid any income tax at all, but they developed, when they were investigating the Morgans, and the Rockefellers, and others about like them, that there were instructions over in the Treasury Department, which I believe were in writing, ordering that if any concern filed an income-tax return there which had the breath of approval of or association with the House of Morgan or the House of Rockefeller there was to be no inquiry and no investigation made into it; and up to this time never has there been anything done to one of these returns which has been made by the Rockefellers or by the Morgans.

Unfortunately, Mr. William Randolph Hearst——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. For nearly 2 years, as the result of the investigation which was inaugurated, the Committee on Banking and Currency held hearings on the stock market. It is impossible even for members of the committee to remember all the testimony which was adduced, but my recollection is that the hearings developed the fact that experts from the Treasury Department not only investigated the tax returns of those who might have had the approval of the Morgan firm, but investigated the tax returns of the Morgan firm as a firm, and the individual members thereof. The difficulty with the Morgan situation at that time was the law itself, under which Mr. Morgan did evade the payment of any income tax for 2 or 3 years, because the law allowed him to extend losses over a period of years, so as to reduce income for a given year. We have corrected that situation as the result of that investigation and that disclosure, so that such a device can no longer be resorted to.

I think it is not quite fair to the Treasury to say that such orders were issued, because my recollection is that the testimony showed that in many of those cases the Treasury experts did investigate, and found that the law itself was such that they could not do anything about it.

Mr. LONG. They found one little loophole whereby Morgan escaped, and they will find another way of escape, and we shall not know anything about it until it is too late to do anything to remedy it.

I am not condemning the Banking and Currency Committee at all. I have no idea of doing that, nor of condemning any particular individuals. I am only condemning the system. The fact is, however, Charles Mitchell was prosecuted for a violation which was found to have existed in the case of hundreds of other bankers who never have been prosecuted. The only reason why they prosecuted Mr. Mitchell, according to the way it looks now, was that Mitchell had gone financially bankrupt. They jumped on Mitchell because Mitchell had used the device of selling property to his wife and buying it back at the market value, thereby taking advantage of the loss which he had incurred in this fictitious transaction. They found that Mitchell was not the only one who did that, Mr. President. Man after man affiliated with Morgan & Co. and with Rockefeller had been doing the same thing. I know of many of them who did it. I can tell the names of others whom they know all about, names of those I know they have investigated, names of those I know they know all about. Notwithstanding the fact that they had tried Mitchell for that offense, the Treasury Department now has records of many other men who did identically the same thing that Charlie Mitchell did, for which he was prosecuted up in New York, and for which he is being sued today.

I do not question the motives of any man in this body, but those outside of Congress who do not want income-tax publicity are those who are intending to gain at the expense of the United States Government. They are the men who expect to keep from having unearthed the amount of money which they have been making every year. Until they have used their various and sundry newly discovered devices to take the place of all the abrogated old devices, until those devices have been discovered after perhaps 15 years' time, as they were the last time, no one will know anything about the incomes of these men, and the only one who will be prosecuted may be someone who has gone into bankruptcy in the meantime.

I am amazed at the turn to the right on the part of our party leaders; and I say that, Mr. President, in sadness. I am amazed at the turn to the right, and I mean away from what I consider to be right, on the part of our party leaders who are tending today to go back and cloak up the very old, corrupt, and crooked practice of the past which led to what we thought was modern legislation to prevent such a thing from happening in the future.

Mr. President, my recollection is that we voted to adopt an amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin to have complete publicity of all returns of income taxes. The amendment was taken into conference, and our conferees came back to us and said, "We have not been able to keep the entire provision intact, but we have arranged for certain information, which is about all the information that anyone ought to be allowed to have, and therefore we will give you this particular slip which is now called the "pink slip."

Whose "pink slip" is this "pink slip"? This "pink slip" is the "pink slip" of the very men who are leading the fight in the United States today to do away with the "pink slip."

They are the men who now say they do not want this information disseminated to the people at all.

My friend from New York [Mr. COPELAND] spoke about having received a great many letters, and stated that I would receive a great many letters protesting against such publicity as is contained on the slip which is now allowed under the law. I desire to say that I get mail from a different class of people. I hear mostly from the common people. I get letters from some of the others, but I think they are people who understand that I am not concerned about hiding the income of anyone, nor with the way people in my district may feel if I do not help them to hide these returns. In other words, I think the people understand that I believe in the income taxes being paid by the makers of big money.

I receive practically no mail at all asking me to vote against publicity of income-tax returns. I have heard from practically no constituent in Louisiana, nor from any person outside Louisiana—and I sometimes receive letters from people in the other States—asking me to vote against that publicity. None of the common people are urging such action; but we have this eleventh hour, great, big bogey man they have created that the gangsters are going to find out how much money you are making and the criminals and the convicts are going to look over and see that last year a man made $5,000 and they are going to waylay his children and kidnap them and threaten to blackjack him and threaten to expose his secret sins since they know what he has made last year. On that kind of a flimsy pretext they have actually excited a Congress of the United States which, if it were to pass this bill, would give some people the impression that it was afraid to go home at night in the dark on account of this "pink slip" provision being in existence.

I think it is the most farcical kind of thing I have ever heard of that men over 21 years old in the United States should be worked upon with this kind of propaganda to do away with what little there is left of value in the way of publicity. Instead of repealing it, why not let us do what we started to do, and what was previously the law, and what ought to be the law—make the publicity complete.

Does anyone want to know why I should know what you pay the Federal Government? It is because it is my business to find out what you pay the Federal Government. It is my business to know whether or not you are paying your proper amount of taxes to educate my children, and my neighbor's children, and your own children. It is my business to find out whether you are making me pay an abnormal part of the taxes by reason of the fact that you are conducting a swindling game to save yourself from paying your rightful share. Do you want to know why we ought to want to know? We ought to want to know because it is our personal, pecuniary business as taxpayers and as citizens of this country. The ordinary man has just as much right to know whether or not he has been swindled or whether his Government has been swindled as some employee of the Treasury Department has a right to know.

What good will it do? It will do this much good in the beginning. It will mean that 125,000,000 people will at least be aware that one man has not the drapery of fraud surrounding him and protecting him from exposure. It will mean that every man, woman, and child may know about what a man has made and about what he has not made, and will know whether he has reported truthfully or falsely if they are allowed to see the returns. We know that condition would be a constant threat against the man who is trying to swindle the United States Government. There is not an honest man returning an honest income who is going to be afraid of his return being investigated. I make that statement and I do not even admit of an exception. I say there is no such thing as a man who has no improper motive being afraid to return every dime of his income and to claim his deductions.

Let me refer to our friends in this body, inasmuch as I was asked about my income. Perhaps some Senators are better off in the matter of the world's goods than some of the rest of us. Would the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] be afraid? I make the assertion that the senior Senator from Michigan, of all men in this body, would be the last one to vote against the canceling of the publicity of income-tax returns. I make the assertion that the man who would probably have the greatest right to complain in this body will be one upon whom we can depend absolutely that he will not only be opposed to it but that he will insist upon retaining it in the law, even though his income shall be made public and be known by every man, woman, and child throughout the length and breadth of the United States.

Who is leading this fight? It is suddenly decided, just before the income taxes are to be paid, that a terrible disaster is being brought about by the the law, so that those who are leading the fight hurry along here just about the time the income taxes are to be filed for this year. I suppose most of them have extensions by this time. It is not very hard to get them. Anyone will be accommodated. I suppose by this time they all have extensions—for what reason?

One of the reasons is that last year it developed that fewer men made $5,000 than did the year before, and that more men made $1,000,000 than did the year before. In other words, fewer men made a moderate income last year and more men made an unwholesome, overburdensome income last year. The chances are this is what is going to happen again this year. If we are allowed to see income-tax returns this year we will be able to see very clearly that the poor are getting poorer, that many people are not making a living wage, that more of the bloated plutocrats are making larger fortunes than they did in the preceding year, and therefore they do not want this provision to remain in the law this year. That is the main reason. The bloated plutocracy do not want it known how well they are faring and how badly the common element are faring as a result of their good fortune. Therefore they hurry to the Congress of the United States in an effort to draw about their income-tax returns the cloak of secrecy.

If anyone needs anything to prove that this entire matter is to be used for the purpose of crooking and robbing the Government, he does not need anything more than this effort to conceal income taxes from publicity. The mere fact that those in the financial centers are trying so hard to conceal their income-tax returns is proof in and of itself that they mean to rob the United States Government in the future as they have been robbing the United States Government in the past. One reason why they want to get this provision off the law books is that they may be able to continue in the future that which has been interfered with in the last year or two. That is what they intend to do, and that is what they are going to do if this provision is wiped off the statute books.

Talk about being afraid of exposure of income! Is Morgan afraid to expose the value of his property holdings on his tax assessment? He files in the county or State in which he lives, and perhaps in the city in which he lives, an itemized statement showing everything he owns. Anyone can take the property-tax return of a concern like Morgan & Co., or any partner in Morgan & Co., or Morgan himself, or Rockefeller himself, and can find listed there every piece of real property he owns, every bond that he owns, every share of stock that he owns, every bank account that he owns. The entire list of the property owned by one of those men on the 1st day of January is contained in his tax return, and it is a matter of public record, usually bearing the sworn affidavit of the man whose property is listed on that tax return.

Are they afraid of that? If we are going to prohibit the publication of one's income-tax return, why not prohibit the publicity of all these tax returns? Why not go back and hide the whole thing? Let us keep these people safe from burglars and gangsters and curiosity seekers not only with reference to what they made last year but what they may have inherited from a hundred years ago. If this is a sound principle, let us go back and add up year by year and day by day what they have made and accumulated, and enact some kind of a law that will prevent the curious eye from visaging what these men have been making in all the years preceding.

That would be the sound thing to do. That would be the only logical thing to do.

The party in power—the Democratic Party—went out to the people of the United States and said certain things. I know they said them, because I heard them say them. I know they said them, because I read their printed documents. I know they said them, because I helped to write some of them which they had printed. That party said that Mellon, while acting as Secretary of the Treasury, had allowed deductions and had allowed refunds amounting to millions and hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars. That party went out and exposed the grand fraud, the grand swindle, the public robbery, the wholesale stealing, the fraud that had been conducted by that crowd, and promised the people that they would see to it that that system never again should reign in the Treasury Department.

It is the same Democratic Party leadership that has come here today in an effort to repeal the little flimsy protection we had enacted into law to prevent that kind of rampant swindle in the future. Nothing is being said about it. What has been the excuse for it? None. There is no excuse for it except that we have been told we must turn to the right, turn to the conservative element; that the radical element will no longer go along with the party, so now we have to bend back around and cater to the conservative element, the reactionary element, in order that the party may remain in power.

We must get away from anything that looks to be liberal, it is said, or anything that might be called radical. We must get away from anything of that kind. We have got to get away from the truth that might come out about the tax returns of these big and influential men. We have got to get away from what appears to be a liberal doctrine pertaining to the rights of 125,000,000 people. We have got to get away from that and reverse the telescope and put the big end to the eye and get the little end away from the eye.

It is being whispered about that the kind of doctrine we have been fighting for must now be reversed; that we must reverse the hands of the clock; that the kind of frauds which we have known to have occurred, which have come to be a national scandal on a wholesale scale, under the Mellon regime and under the Mills regime, are now going to be made just as possible under the regime now in office.

What difference does it make who is Secretary of the Treasury? It makes very little difference. The rank and file of the Treasury Department now is practically the same as it was under Mellon and Mills, and always will be. The employees will be kept there, generally, on their records. It is not public employees who keep men from swindling the Government on the returns they make of their incomes. It is the fact that 125,000,000 people know everything about them, if they want to. It is the fact that if a man has an enormous income that the man next door may know about, or the man in the next office may know about, ordinarily the man who is in business with the man of enormous income, or who lives in the community with him, who is honest, and who is paying his taxes, is not going to sit idly by and allow the other man to swindle the Government which he himself has not swindled. That is the reason for this publicity.

Oh, no; the administration is turning around to the right. It is about time for it to become reactionary. I see Mr. Hopkins says that 37 percent of all New York is on the dole relief rolls today. I read in the newspapers that Mr. Hopkins' department now says that out of every 100 persons in New York 37 are on the dole, and I see they are estimating that the proportion will be 50 percent before very much longer. That is about where we are landing; so we had better turn a little bit further, veer around more to the right.

Do not forget this, Mr. President: I am still speaking as a party man, because I am still a party man. I am followed pretty well by the Democrats of my State. Not only am I the leader of the democracy of my State, but I am followed by the Democrats of my State, because I am still advocating the Democratic doctrine which carries the Democratic Party into power. Do not forget the Maine campaign of 1932, when Mr. Hoover's administration had a large number of people on the relief roll. When we began to try to carry Maine for the Democratic Party, so that the first State to vote might show up well, Hoover's own crowd, the Republicans' own crowd, tried to keep the men they had on the Republican relief dole from voting, because they figured they were going to vote against them. We had a terrible argument to prevent the Republican Hoover crowd from disqualifying the people who were on the relief roll from having the right to vote in that election, because we figured they would vote against Hoover's ticket. We won out; and, as a result of the people who were on the dole being allowed to vote, we beat the Hoover ticket in the Maine election, and it was the surprise of the United States.

Mark my words: The people who are on the dole under this Democratic administration are going to feel just exactly like the people who were on the dole under the Republican administration. A dole is a dole, and the man who is on the dole knows that he is there as a result of evil. He knows he is there as a result of what is wrong in the Government. He knows he is there as a result of the fact that promises have not been kept; that what he was allowed to expect has not been performed.

This tonic that is being fed to the leadership of the Democratic Party in the States and in the Congress and in the Executive Departments, this advice that "You had better turn conservative, and turn around to the right, and turn reactionary, and get away from all these liberal and alleged-to-be radical things that you have done", is the advice to destruction and to wreckage and to ruin. This is one of the charted landmarks—one of the mileposts, you may call it—to show that we are steadily, drastically turning in that direction.

I am astonished that the President of the United States has not sent a message to Congress about this bill. I am astonished that before he left on his fishing trip he did not say something about this monstrosity. I should almost be tempted to interfere with his pleasure among the goggle-eyes and the catfish by wiring him and asking him to send a message to Congress if I were in close contact with him. That is what I should do. The idea of such a bill as this being brought in here, in the present condition of the public Treasury, when it is reported that this year our income-tax receipts are going up by leaps and bounds—why? One of the reasons is because there is a kind of half-way publicity. Experience has already proved the virtue of publishing the income-tax returns, and we are told that the receipts are going up; that they are hundreds of millions of dollars more than they would have gotten under the old system. Why turn around now and cancel out what is necessary to get more money into the Treasury?

I started to say that the President saw fit to send a message to the last Congress against the bonus. He saw fit to send a message to this Congress saying that if the McCarran amendment were enacted it would cost the United States Government an extra billion dollars, and that extra billion dollars would destroy the credit standing of United States bonds. In other words, according to the President of the United States, one more billion dollars taken out of the Treasury of the United States in this year is the difference between solvency and chaos in the national credit! That is the President's own figure; and yet we are called on to repeal a provision of law that is bringing many, many dollars—thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars—into the Treasury, because somebody has thrown up this bogey smoke-screen that "a gangster is going to go and look at my tax return in the midnight hour, and kidnap my child, and blackmail my wife."

Are sensible men, legislating for 125,000,000 people in the United States, going to be led away with that kind of a claptrap bogeyism into annulling the only thing we have today that means a thimbleful of protection against swindling the United States Treasury out of another billion dollars this year and next year? Is that the kind of a reason we are going to have on the one hand, and a contrary reason on the other hand? One time we must do nothing that will

impair the credit of the United States Government, and another time we must come along here and repeal the only thing that really makes men be honest in their reports, when they would like to swindle the United States Government!

Now I desire to say something which I have not said on this floor before, which I hope will go in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and be read. It is this:

I understand there is a little argument between the Rockefellers and the Morgans as to who has the inside track down here right now. It seems that the two families have become a little bit jealous of one another. Of course, they are all for the system which preserves them all; but it seems there is always a big row on as to whether the Morgan house has the inside track in Washington or whether the Rockefeller family has the inside track.

I never really appreciated that part. My national training and education has been so sadly neglected that I never understood the importance of that particular equation; but they say that there is always here a silent, undercover but determined fight over whether the Rockefellers or the Morgans shall have the first bite of the cake—that is, which one shall have the inside track; which family shall predominate in the fiscal and public affairs of the country.

I was reading the other day the book of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Sr. He is another one of these fellows who wrote a book. I once wrote one myself, but he wrote a book in violation of the injunction in the Scripture:

Oh, that mine enemy would write a book!

He wrote a book, and in this book he said that the one great thing that had helped him to extend the control and domain of the Standard Oil Co. into foreign countries was the influence they had been able to exert through the State Department from Washington. That is the statement in Mr. Rockefeller's book. I am going to bring it over here and read it to the Senate in a day or two. He said in his book that the one great thing which had always helped the Standard Oil Co. to permeate into all other countries was the fact that they had the immediate touch and contact and feeling proclivities and insidious maneuvering of the State Department.

I understand that they have managed to keep it that way, that there is a career system in the State Department, that they keep their representatives on a career basis. The man who has made good in the lines of what they call the career grading points stays there, and his career has largely been gaged by what service he has been able to render to these proclivities of the Rockefellers and their affiliated interests.

I am told that the Secretary of State is a mere figurehead when it comes to that kind of business, the business of regulating our contacts with foreign countries. I am told that most of the time the Secretary of State does not even know what is going on. I am told that they do not even call on the Secretary of State to talk these matters over, that they will send over to the country and get our ambassador, and he will go into the executive department and discuss the matter, and that the Secretary of State is not even supposed to know what is going on about it.

I will tell the Senate how well I know that. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] was conducting an investigation in the old Commerce Committee of the Senate. There was a young man from my State by the name of Jefferson Caffery. In connection with the Bosco fraud which was pulled off in Mellon's interest down in Colombia, whereby they held up loans to be made by the United States until the Republic of Colombia granted to Mellon's company the right to lay pipe lines across the Republic of Colombia, it developed that this young man, Jefferson Caffery, from my State, had been sent to handle the entire negotiation.

After the Senator from California had made the report, I was prepared to protest in the Senate against the confirmation of Mr. Caffery. But when the young man came to me he unfolded to me that he was merely carrying out what he was supposed to do, and the executive department and the State Department insisted that it was that kind of man they needed, it was Mr. Jefferson Caffery they needed for Cuba, that they had to have him, that there was no other man so well equipped for the kind of service which had to be rendered in Cuba as Mr. Caffery.

Since Mr. Caffery made it very plain that all he had done in Colombia was done in carrying out the traditional policy of the United States, as he had been instructed, I made no objection, but voted to confirm him, in order that I might help out the executive department and the State Department to get the representative whom they said they had to have, the man who had the identical kind of experience necessary at that particular moment in Cuba.

Mr. Caffery went on down to Cuba, and, lo and behold, I found out that they did need him down there. Why? Because the Rockefeller banks and the Morgan banks, the Chase National Bank, and the National City Bank had loaned large sums of money to Cuba and to various private and public enterprises in Cuba, and the rebellion in Cuba was over the fact that the American financiers were extracting from that little fallen island so many millions and millions of dollars every year that they were not leaving enough in the country for the poor Cubans to live on. The overthrow of the Government in Cuba may have been due to the fact that they were likely to cancel the debts of these American financiers—I almost used another name—and therefore they had to have somebody to send down to Cuba who understood these manipulations from Dan to Beersheba, in order to preserve the financial solvency and the contacts which had been established by reason of these flotations made out of the House of Rockefeller and out of the House of Morgan.

Mr. Caffery is there, and today Cuba is struggling, one revolution occurring after another. They are having an awful time to keep any man down there. It can hardly be done. They will never be able to keep any government there very long, just as I said here a couple of years ago. They will not be able to keep any government there very long, because in Cuba there is practically no such thing as an independent ownership of anything. There is hardly a Cuban who owns anything, unless it is bonded for as much as he can get for it or more.

Everything has been chained and paralyzed, and therefore Cuba must be kept subdued under one of these careerists, who understands that the career system means the Pan American financial control over Latin American affairs by the House of Rockefeller and the House of Morgan and their allies. So now we begin to get a little publicity of this matter.

They go down to Bolivia and finance the war against Paraguay, so much so that the Argentine Republic had to close down a radio station operated by the Standard Oil Co. on the soil of Argentina because they found that that radio station was being used for the purpose of aiding the war of Bolivia against Paraguay. That was done by Argentina, but you did not hear a word about it, not a word in the Senate or in this country, not a word, when the Argentine Republic seized the radio station of the Standard Oil Co. and closed it down on the ground that it was being used for the purpose of promoting belligerency between Bolivia and Paraguay. There was not a word of that here.

Along about that time there showed up a gentleman whose name I have mentioned on the floor of the Senate many times. He showed up and went to testify before the munitions committee, and advised the committee that the United States ought to buy large quantities of tin immediately because some war was likely to start and the country would not have tin enough. The reason why he was advising the purchase of tin was the fact that Bolivia had a great deposit of tin, and Bolivia could not carry the war on much longer unless she sold some tin. So Brother Baruch came and advised that the United States buy a great deal of tin.

All we have to do is to go back and trace developments and we find that which has been used for the purpose of carrying forward the interests of these houses of Rockefeller and of Morgan time after time. They do not want any publicity. "Save us from the light of day," say these honest and honorable men.

There used to be a saying in politics that is apropos, and I wonder how many here have heard it. Someone said that

a fellow remarked about a man, "That man is a rascal." Another said, "I know he is a rascal, but don't say that now. He is our rascal now." [Laughter.] So now, what is the policy of our good Democratic Party? Are we going to say that this system which we claim was defrauding the people of the United States was being conducted by a set of rascals, or are we going to say "Hush, hush. They are our rascals now. We have turned to the right. We have taken the rascals in. We have shielded them from publicity. They are our rascals now."

Mr. President, that means the faith and the conservation of democracy, for which we went 3,000 miles to fight a few years ago, and then came back and tried to make this country safe for something else. It is a matter of "hush, hush", covering the matter up, glossing it over, not inquiring.

No one will find the common man kicking about anybody investigating his income-tax returns. Ninety-six percent of the people of the United States do not make any income-tax returns. How many here knew that? Ninety-six percent of the people in the United States do not make income-tax returns, do not make enough money so that they have to pay an income tax. The 96 percent are just as much concerned, and more concerned, in whether or not the select 4 percent, the chosen 4 percent, the fortunate 4 percent, are reporting upon the profits they have taken from the sweat of the brows of the 96 percent as are the ones who are making the money themselves.

Mr. President, I have consumed more time than I had expected to. Since the Senator from Mississippi stated that he thought there ought to be some discussion until 5 o'clock, I thought I would take advantage of the opportunity and save the Senate that much time, and fill in at a time when nobody else wanted to speak. I would not have taken the time of the Senate this afternoon except for the fact that there were 30 minutes when nobody else wanted to speak, and I have merely filled in, so that I might not take time from somebody else at a time when he might want to speak.

PROPOSED NAVAL MANEUVERS IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am receiving a great many letters with regard to the proposed maneuvers of our fleet in the Pacific Ocean next summer. Grave fears are expressed with regard to that program. Some protests against it have been received. Others request that the committee urge that the maneuvers be not held.

I have received such a letter from Prof. Kenneth S. Latourette, professor of missions and oriental history at Yale University. I have the highest regard for his opinion and his ability, and the high motives which animate him in writing this letter. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter from Professor Latourette and my reply thereto.

I think possibly my reply may serve as an answer to a great many letters which are being written to me. I hope it will give those who write me a better understanding of the reasons for the maneuvers in the Pacific, and why they should have no fear with regard to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MALONEY in the chair). Without objection, the letters presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The letters referred to are as follows:

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn., March 20, 1935.

Hon. KEY PITTMAN,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PITTMAN: May I express to you my very grave misgivings concerning the proposed naval maneuvers of our fleet in the Pacific this summer? As one who has long been a student of Far Eastern affairs, it seems to me that this measure at this particular time threatens to put additional strain upon the relations between ourselves and Japan, which may be fraught with serious consequences. I very much hope that the Committee on Foreign Relations, under your distinguished leadership, may deem it wise and possible to suggest that the plans be altered.

Respectfully yours,

K. S. LATOURETTE.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

Prof. KENNETH S. LATOURETTE,
Professor of Missions and Oriental History,
Yale University, 409 Prospect Street, New Haven, Conn.

MY DEAR PROFESSOR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 20, 1935.

In this letter you state, "May I express to you my very grave misgivings concerning the proposed naval maneuvers of our fleet in the Pacific this summer?" I have the highest respect for your opinion, and fully realize the patriotic and humane motives that inspired your communication. I regret to be impelled to inform you, however, that I do not have the same misgivings, nor can I concur with you in your suggestions.

Our fleet is one of the defensive arms of our military force and is intended primarily to protect our coast against hostile raids and the destruction of the lives and property of our citizens.

We have the longest coast line of any country in the world. It is lined with large cities of great wealth and beauty and inhabited by our citizens of the highest type. There may not be, nor do I believe there is, any imminent danger of an attack upon our borders; but that this peaceful condition will always exist we are not at liberty, by virtue of our duties, to presume. One of the first duties of a government is to protect its citizens in their lives and property against hostile, violent, and illegal attacks.

The Pacific Ocean is not only the largest but it is bordered by more countries than any other ocean. It is even now a great artery of commerce not only between the nations of the world but between our own States and possessions.

It is the duty of our Government to train its officers and sailors in any and all waters where naval actions may become necessary in defense of our coast. The conditions in the Pacific in many respects are quite different from those that prevail in the Atlantic Ocean. It is necessary, therefore, that we train our naval forces in the Pacific as well as in the Atlantic and in the Gulf of Mexico.

In conducting the proposed naval maneuvers it will not be necessary for our fleet to approach within 1,500 miles of the coast of any other country except Canada or Mexico, neither of which would be excited by the peaceful operations of our fleet in the Pacific.

I know of no strained relations between our Government and any other government that threaten war. There may be diplomatic differences that will ultimately require conferences and peaceful solutions, but I have no fear but that amicable understandings may be arrived at. The President of the United States longs, as no other ruler does, for peace at home and abroad. During his brief administration he has continuously and actively made every effort to establish conditions of peace throughout the world. This is known to the rulers and statesmen of all countries. It is impossible for me to even imagine that the President of the United States, who, under the Constitution, is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States when these forces are called into active service, and who, as Chief Executive of our Government, has exclusive jurisdiction and control over the Army and fleet in times of peace, would permit any action by our fleet that could reasonably bring about strained relations between our Government and any other government.

There are jingoes in every country who, actuated either by political ambition or expediency, longing for power, or by unjustifiable fear, are constantly crying "war." Those who have duties to perform cannot afford to be affected by such jingoism.

I may say that, in my opinion, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, or the Senate which it represents, having no jurisdiction over the operations of the fleet, would in no case attempt to interfere with or even advise the Executive with regard to the operations of the fleet unless it clearly appeared that he was about to perform some act which would gravely threaten the welfare of our people. Certainly, no such situation exists by reason of the proposed maneuvers of our fleet in the Pacific this coming summer.

Sincerely,

KEY PITTMAN.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HARRISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Hiram Church Ford, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge, eastern district of Kentucky, to succeed A. M. J. Cochran, deceased.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably Executive F, Seventy-third Congress, second session, a general treaty of inter-American arbitration, signed at Washington on January 5, 1929, with an understanding.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MALONEY in the chair). The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Education and Labor I report favorably a nomination and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. In doing so, I desire to point out the fact that there are now but two members of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, one membership not having been filled. The member whose term has expired, and whose nomination the committee is reporting favorably, is Mr. John M. Morin, of Pennsylvania.

The act creating the Commission makes the office vacant at the expiration of the term of the Commissioner. The office is now vacant, and there is only one Commissioner operating, with the result that there is not a majority of the Commission able to sign orders or to perform the duties of the Commission.

On that account and at the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and with the accord of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], I ask unanimous consent for the immediate confirmation of the nominee, who is the present incumbent, or was the incumbent before the term of his commission expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Morin, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate confirmation of Mr. Morin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I know nothing about an agreement with the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Oregon has been consulted by the Senator from Pennsylvania, who was especially urgent in this matter, and was conferred with today by Mr. Morin, the gentleman whose nomination has been reported. The Senator from Oregon has no objection. I think he appreciates the importance of speedy action. Mr. Morin was the Republican member of this Commission and held office until the date his commission expired, about 2 weeks ago, with the result that he is there working but not receiving salary, and has no authority. There is only one member of the Commission, with the result that the poor people who should receive compensation payments are having their payments held up. That is the reason why we are asking that the nomination be speedily acted upon.

Mr. AUSTIN. The nomination has been pending for 2 weeks, has it not?

Mr. WALSH. No. For some reason the President failed to send the nomination to the Senate until Saturday, but Mr. Morin's commission expired 2 weeks ago. There has been an interregnum during which no one has been appointed to the position. It was announced that Mr. Morin was nominated by the President on Saturday, and therefore the committee, because of the pressing character of the situation, acted very speedily.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest that the nomination go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the Senator from Vermont will not ask that that be done, because here is an office which is vacant; the Commission is unable to perform its functions; and persons who have been in the Federal service and who have been injured are unable to obtain their payments, which are being held up because one man is not able to function—a man of ability, honesty, and integrity.

It seems to me there is no reason for not proceeding to confirm the nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will permit me to make a suggestion, I know Mr. Morin. I served in the House of Representatives with him for many years. He was appointed to this Commission many years ago, and has rendered satisfactory service. It is really only a routine reappointment. I can appreciate the urgency in this case. I am sure no objection would be urged on the part of anyone.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, all these reasons appeal to me. They appeal to my reason, they appeal to my heart, and all that; but no matter what my emotions may be, I am the only Republican present in the Chamber at this time.

Mr. WALSH. The leader on the Republican side has been consulted about the nomination, and has approved it. I knew his objection, and I said to Mr. Morin, "I know what the attitude of the Senator is, and you must get his consent." He reported that he had done so. The Senator from Vermont is undertaking to modify the agreement entered into by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am the only Senator now present on the Republican side. I cannot conceive that there is so much need for haste in the matter.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator may make his objection. While ordinarily I should much prefer that the nomination go over, I was much impressed by the fact that there are people all over the country who are waiting to get their compensation checks. It seemed to me it was a matter of human interest, not for Mr. Morin but for the people who need their money. They should be permitted to get their checks, which they cannot get until Mr. Morin is confirmed.

Mr. HARRISON. Will not the Senator from Vermont permit the nomination to be confirmed this afternoon, with the understanding that when the Senate meets tomorrow, if the Senator from Oregon should desire to move reconsideration, the Senator from Massachusetts will not object to reconsideration of the nomination?

Mr. WALSH. I desired to request also that the usual rule requiring nominations to be held over 2 days before the President is notified be suspended, because it is important to have immediate action in this case.

Mr. AUSTIN. In view of what the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has said, I propose this agreement: I am willing to have the nomination confirmed with the understanding that if any Senator on this side of the Chamber shall object and request that the nomination be reconsidered, it shall be done. The hour is late, and Senators have left the Chamber without notice that this matter was coming up. I admit that all the reasons stated and all the emotional considerations appeal to me personally, and yet I feel that if the nomination is to be confirmed tonight it should be subject to such an agreement.

Mr. WALSH. I will agree to that. I say to the Senator now that I am just as anxious as he is not to permit nominations to be confirmed too hastily. I dislike very much to make this request, and at first I refused to do it; but after Mr. Morin told me of the situation, and after he had gone to the Senator from Oregon, I could not refuse to submit the request. I act under the same limitations and restrictions which influence the Senator when it comes to hastening confirmations; but it seems to me this is an unusual case, and is entitled to prompt action. I agree that there may be a reconsideration tomorrow if desired.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. COUZENS. Under the circumstances, I shall not object to the confirmation, but I shall object to notification to the President. We have had trouble with that practice before, and it has led to days and days of debate. While I do not object to the confirmation, I shall object to the President being notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Mr. AUSTIN. Subject to the condition upon which we have agreed, I have no objection.

Mr. WALSH. That is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

HIRAM C. FORD—EASTERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of what has transpired, I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Vermont to a situation which I desire to describe.

In the eastern Federal judicial district of Kentucky there has been a vacancy for 9 months. I suppose it is no secret that Mr. Stanley Reed, who was the general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was agreed upon and recommended last August for this position, with the understanding that he would remain with the R. F. C. until the first of the year.

In the meantime, at the invitation of the Attorney General, he was asked to participate in the gold cases pending before the Supreme Court. About the time they were disposed of or soon after that a vacancy occurred in the office of the Solicitor General. The Attorney General and the President persuaded Mr. Reed to accept appointment to that office, which he has done. He has been confirmed and was sworn in yesterday in his new position.

This made it necessary to select someone else for the Federal judgeship. That selection was made a few days ago, the nomination was sent to the Senate, and today the Judiciary Committee reported the nomination of Judge Hiram Church Ford, of Georgetown, who is one of the outstanding State judges of Kentucky, to fill this vacancy.

For 9 months there has been no court held in that district. Men are in jail and cases have piled up because of the delay. The next important term of court will begin in Covington next Monday. It is extremely important that Judge Ford be confirmed, the commission issued, and that he take the oath of office in time to hold court next Monday in Covington.

For that reason I had intended to ask that the nomination be confirmed today and that the President be notified, because otherwise Judge Ford cannot qualify in time to hold court as I have indicated. There has been no regular term of that court held in 9 months.

I appeal to the Senator from Vermont in the circumstances that the request be granted.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, this is the appointment of a United States district judge, I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is right.

Mr. AUSTIN. The nomination is not even on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not on the calendar because it was just reported today.

Mr. AUSTIN. Under the rule, it must go over anyway, must it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would have to go over except by unanimous consent.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I feel it my duty, regardless of what the Senator has said——

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say what I omitted to say, that I have conferred with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, and I have conferred with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and described the situation to both of those Senators as I have described it here. Both of them agreed not to object.

Mr. AUSTIN. I feel constrained to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The calendar is in order.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that nominations of postmasters may be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HARRISON. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 27, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 26 (legislative day of Mar. 13), 1935

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

John M. Morin to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Leo F. Walton, Lafayette.

CALIFORNIA

Robert E. O'Connell, Jr., Redwood City.

MISSOURI

David Fitzwater, Creve Coeur.
L. Dorsey Mitchell, La Grange.
Tom C. Short, Mountain Grove.
Merlin L. Grannemann, New Haven.
Grover C. Young, Niangua.

NEW JERSEY

William H. Fisher, Phillipsburg.

NORTH CAROLINA

Savannah B. Smoak, Wilkesboro.

OREGON

Sylvester D. Goshert, Nyssa.

RHODE ISLAND

Laura Francois, Alton.
George W. Jenckes, Slatersville.
Grace S. Croome, West Kingston.

TEXAS

Jasper N. Fallis, Clifton.

WISCONSIN

William J. Sullivan, Campbellsport.

Confirmation omitted from the Record of March 23 (legislative day of Mar. 13), 1935

POSTMASTER

CONNECTICUT

Inez V. Lawson, Wilton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Sidney S. Tedesche, Ph. D., of the Union Temple of Brooklyn, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, great Architect of the Universe, who ordainest all Thy measures with a plan, though Thy purposes are past our finding, we pray that Thou mayest be with us this day.

Thou didst say unto men, in the early age of faith, "Not by might and not by power, but by My spirit." Mayest Thou again bring home unto us this truth from the revelations of history: Not by numbers of armed men, nor the material mass of men's wealth, but by the spirit of the Lord can nations prevail.

Implant that spirit within us, our Father, and give us an understanding of justice and equity so that, consecrated to high endeavor, we may be enabled to serve Thee and to serve our fellow men in Thy name.

May the words of our mouth and the meditations of our heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5913) entitled "An act making appropriations for the mili-

tary and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-three Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were closed, the Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Adair	Doutrich	Kahn	Peyser
Allen	Dunn, Miss.	Kennedy, Md.	Rayburn
Andrews, N. Y.	Dunn, Pa.	Kleberg	Robsion, Ky.
Arends	Englebright	Kvale	Rogers, Okla.
Bacon	Farley	Lamneck	Schaefer
Bankhead	Ferguson	Lea, Calif.	Seger
Bolton	Gambrill	Lesinski	Shannon
Casey	Granfield	McGehee	Smith, W. Va.
Chapman	Greenwood	McKeough	Snell
Clark, Idaho	Griswold	McLean	Stewart
Clark, N. C.	Hartley	McLeod	Tobey
Crosby	Healey	Meeks	Treadway
Crowther	Hess	Mott	Truax
Daly	Hobbs	Norton	Underwood
Dickstein	Hollister	Patton	Wood
Disney	Johnson, W. Va.	Pettengill	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-eight Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a short bill I introduced yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION AND ALIEN DEPORTATION

Mr. GREEN. Today that great fraternal and patriotic order known as the "Elks" presented to the Presiding Officers of the House and Senate, on the front steps of the Capitol, long petitions in favor of the exclusion and deportation of alien enemies of our Government. For many months the members of this great organization have been waging a vigorous campaign of education, thus arousing sentiment in favor of legislation that would better protect us from such alien enemies within our gates. On yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 7079, that would accomplish this end. It is an immigration-restriction and alien-deportation bill, along the line of bills I previously introduced when on the Immigration Committee and along the lines of bills introduced by my good friend and coworker, Congressman DIES, of Texas, with whom I served and cooperated when a member of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The bill, H. R. 7079, differs from his bills in that it would not allow an alien member of an organization that is plotting and planning the overthrow of our Government by force and violence and the assassination of public officials to avoid deportation by pleading fear and duress, would expressly require aliens admitted for permanent residence to apply for naturalization and to assume the duties and responsibilities of citizenship within the statutory naturalization period of 5 years or be deported; and would require the reporting annually to Congress of all stayed or suspended alien deportations, with all the facts and reasons therefor, as well as all petitions, recommendations, and protests in connection therewith, to the end that if Congress did not promptly affirmatively approve such delayed deportations the aliens should be forthwith deported as the existing law directs.

H. R. 7079 contains all of the strengthening amendments recommended by the Department of Labor and the Commissioner of Immigration, and more, and would take care of all meritorious hardship-deportation cases by directing the Secretary of Labor to report them annually to Congress for action. It does not contain the suggested discretions to deport or not deport alien criminals as the Secretary of Labor "finds in the public interest" and would repeal the discretion given the Secretary in the naturalization law passed in 1932 as a result of which last year there were readmitted deported anarchists like Emma Goldman, who went about the country giving out interviews and abusing our hospitality, as Strachey has been doing, by declaring she was "more of an anarchist than ever before." We have quite enough radicals of our own and of second-generation foreign stock without importing any more or tolerating any such display of bad taste and breach of hospitality as Emma Goldman, John Strachey, Willie Musenberg, Henry Barbusse, and other notorious anarchists, or direct-action Communists, have been exhibiting.

H. R. 7079 would not only deport habitual aliens, habitual alien criminals, enemies of our Government, dope peddlers, alien smugglers, aliens carrying machine and sawed-off shotguns, as practically all racketeers and gangsters do, but it would further restrict immigration by reducing existing European quotas 75 percent and applying the quota system of restrictions to countries of this hemisphere, reserving 75 percent of those quotas for the very near relatives, such as aged parents and the like, of naturalized-foreign-born and foreign-born residents lawfully in the United States able to support them.

Last year over 163,000 aliens legally entered the United States—an increase of about 9 percent over the previous year—and undoubtedly there were almost as many, if not more, aliens that entered illegally, because the Immigration Service reports a 50-percent increase in alien stow-aways, deserting seamen, and the like over the previous year, and that alien smuggling is on the increase—boats, automobiles, and even a number of airplanes being apprehended smuggling aliens into our country. A current release of the Department of State on the immigration work of the Department calls attention to the startling facts that our consular offices report a waiting list of over a quarter million and that there are in 47 of the 68 European quota countries alone 992,160 aliens desirous of coming to the United States.

During the past 10 years of quota restriction on European immigration over 3,000,000 aliens have entered the United States, and the last census reveals the largest number of foreign born, over 14 millions; the largest foreign stock population, over 40 millions; and the most aliens, over 6 millions, in our whole history. What we need is an immigration holiday; and my bill's enactment would give it to us by reducing existing quotas 75 percent, reserving them practically for parents and other near relatives, and extending quota restrictions to countries of this hemisphere whose immigrants are not now numerically limited and which countries absolutely exclude our nationals from entry for permanent residence or to work. We have over 10,000,000 unemployed and do not need and ought not to have admitted last year the hundreds of alien skilled and unskilled workers and job hunters that came in the 163,904 aliens the Bureau of Immigration reports legally entering our country during the fiscal year 1934. We have too many unemployed as it is without importing another one. Not only have we too many unemployed but we have too many applicants for relief, too many dependents, defectives, and delinquents without allowing another one to be imported. Each country should care for its own unemployed and dependents. Charity should begin at home. Immigration should be further restricted and practically suspended, as H. R. 7079 provides. If enacted, it will not only really restrict immigration, but it will deport the three or four million aliens illegally and unlawfully in the country, and by so doing go a long way toward solving our unemployment and relief problems, because the bill expressly provides that all aliens must get naturalized forthwith or get out, and aliens illegally here cannot produce

the necessary certificate of legal entry absolutely necessary for naturalization.

H. R. 7079 is as follows:

A bill to authorize the prompt deportation of habitual criminals and habitual aliens, to guard against the separation from their families of certain law-abiding aliens, to deport direct-action Communists, to further restrict immigration into the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That an alien who entered the United States either from a foreign territory or an insular possession, either before or after the passage of this act, shall be promptly deported in the manner provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889, 890; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155, 156), as amended, regardless of when he entered, if he

(1) At any time after entry is convicted of an offense, which may be punished by imprisonment for a term of 1 year or more, or of a crime involving moral turpitude, the said deportation to be made by the Secretary of Labor forthwith at the time he is released from confinement, or is placed upon probation, or is pardoned; or

(2) Has been convicted of possessing or carrying any concealed or dangerous weapons; or

(3) Knowingly possesses or carries any weapon which shoots or is designed to shoot, automatically or semiautomatically, more than one shot without manual reloading, by a single function or trigger; or

(4) Has been convicted of violation of a State narcotic law; or

(5) Knowingly encouraged, induced, assisted, abetted, or aided anyone to enter or try to enter the United States in violation of law; or

(6) Does not within 1 year after the enactment of this act, or if he enters thereafter does not within 1 year after entry, declare his intention to become a citizen of the United States and fails to use due diligence and to become within the 5 years' statutory naturalization period a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That this particular provision shall not apply to nonimmigrant aliens admitted temporarily under section 3 and to nonquota immigrant aliens admitted temporarily under section 4 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, so long as the said nonimmigrant and nonquota immigrant aliens maintain the temporary admission status under which they were admitted; or

(7) Is a member of or affiliated with any organization which, or who believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either specific individuals or officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, of the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property, or sabotage, or a doctrine which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of governments, constituted authority, or social order, existing in countries not under the control of Communists and the establishment in place thereof a regime termed "proletarian dictatorship" or a system based upon common ownership of property and abolition of private property, provided that the platform, program, or objectives of the Third Internationale or Communist International shall be held to embrace the said doctrine.

SEC. 2. That from and after July 1, 1935, the quota in the case of any nationality for which a quota has been determined and proclaimed under the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be 25 percent of such quota, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100. From and after July 1, 1935, no immigration visas shall be issued under subdivision (c) of section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 204), but all the provisions of the immigration laws shall be applicable to immigrants born in any of the geographical areas specified in such subdivision as if each of such areas had at that time a quota equal to 25 percent (but not less than 100) of the number of nonquota immigration visas issued, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, to immigrants born in such area: *Provided, however,* That reciprocal arrangements may be entered into by the Department of State and the Department of Labor with the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, and Mexico whereby as many immigrants born in the respective foreign contiguous territories to continental United States are admitted to the United States annually as persons born in the United States are annually admitted into those respective countries. Section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153), as amended (U. S. C., supp. VI, title 8, sec. 206), is amended to read as follows:

"(A) Immigration visas as to quota immigrants shall be issued in each fiscal year as follows: (1) 75 percent of each nationality for such year shall be made available in each year for the issuance of immigration visas to the following classes of immigrants: (a) Quota immigrants who are the fathers or the mothers or the husbands by marriage occurring after January 1, 1933, of citizens of the United States who are 21 years of age or over; and (b) quota immigrants who are unmarried children under 21 years of age, or the wives, or husbands, or the mother, or the father, of alien residents of the United States who were lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"(2) Any portion of the quota of each nationality for such year not required for the issuance of immigration visas to the classes specified in paragraph 1 shall be made available in such year for the issuance of immigration visas to other quota immigrants of such nationality.

"(B) The preference provided in paragraphs 1 and 2 of subdivision (a) shall, in the case of quota immigrants of any nationality, be given in the calendar month in which the right of preference is established, if the number of immigration visas which may be issued in any such month to quota immigrants of such nationality has not already been issued; otherwise in the next calendar month."

SEC. 3. That if any alien has been arrested and deported in pursuance of law, he shall be excluded from admission to the United States whether such deportation took place before or after the enactment of this act, and if he enters or attempts to enter the United States after the enactment of this act he shall be guilty of felony and upon conviction thereof shall, unless a different penalty is otherwise provided by law, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 2 years or by a fine of not more than $1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment: *Provided,* That this act shall not apply to any alien who has, prior to its enactment, obtained the lawful permission of the Secretary of Labor to reenter the United States and has reentered or who arrives in the United States with such permission within 60 days after this act becomes effective. For the purposes of this section any alien ordered deported (whether before or after the enactment of this act), who has left the United States, shall be considered to have been deported in pursuance of law, irrespective of the source from which the expenses of his transportation were defrayed or of the place to which deported. Section 7 of the act entitled "An act to further amend the naturalization laws, and for other purposes", approved May 25, 1932, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Labor may suspend for not more than 1 year the order or warrant of deportation of any alien of good moral character, subject to deportation under the provisions of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 155), and section 14 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 162; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 214), only, provided such alien has been in the United States 10 years, or has an American citizen wife, husband, child, or aged, dependent parent, and is in sympathy with our form of government, and has declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States. As to each such said suspension, the said Secretary shall forthwith report to the Congress, if in session, or if not in session, then the first day after Congress is in session, all the facts and reasons for such suspended order or warrant of deportation, and all recommendations, petitions, appeals, protests, and the like, in connection therewith; and the Secretary of Labor shall at the end of 6 months, or upon the adjournment of Congress, whichever is sooner, after such report is made to the Congress, unless Congress shall have by law or resolution directed otherwise, execute and carry out such order or warrant of deportation. If Congress should direct the cancelation of said order or warrant of deportation the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization may accept any head tax therefor due and unpaid, may amend nunc pro tunc the entry record of the alien so as to establish lawful admission for permanent residence, and may issue, upon the receipt of the fee required therefor by law, a certificate of arrival.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Labor may specifically designate persons holding supervisory positions in the Immigration and Naturalization Service to issue warrants for the arrest of aliens believed to be subject to deportation under this or any other statute: *Provided,* That no person shall act under a warrant issued by himself.

SEC. 6. The first sentence in section 21 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874), entitled "An act regulating the immigration of aliens to, and residence of aliens in, the United States, and for other purposes", is hereby amended, effective as of the date of this act, to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. That any arriving alien, who has already obtained an immigration visa in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153), as amended, liable to be excluded because likely to become a public charge or because of physical disability other than tuberculosis in any form or a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease may, if otherwise admissible, nevertheless be admitted upon the giving of a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Secretary of Labor, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, cities, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof, holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, cities, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against such alien becoming a public charge."

SEC. 7. Any employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall have power to detain for investigation any alien whom he has reason to believe is subject to deportation under this or any other act. Any alien so detained shall be immediately brought before an immigrant inspector designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Labor and shall not be held in custody for more than 24 hours thereafter unless prior to the expiration of that time a warrant for his arrest is issued.

SEC. 8. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe rules and regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. The foregoing provisions of this act with the exception of parts of sections 2 and 3 and all of section 8, are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws, including section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889, U. S. C., title 8, sec. 155), and shall be enforced as part of such laws.

SEC. 10. Clause (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 155), as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 206 (a)), which grants to quota immigrants skilled in agriculture, their wives, and their dependent children under the age of 18 years, a preference within the quota, is repealed.

THE SOUTH AND THE NEW DEAL

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by my colleague, Mr. FISH, of New York, on the operation of the new deal in the South.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Representative HAMILTON FISH, Jr., of New York, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, including the Dixie network, Tuesday evening, March 26, 1935:

I am grateful to the Columbia Broadcasting System for the opportunity to speak over the Dixie network and to reach 23 radio stations in the South. I hope my invisible audience, many of whom may not agree with my political views, will stay on the radio and listen to a presentation of the facts, disagreeable though they may be, affecting their own interests and livelihood.

At any rate, if ruin and disaster smites the cotton and textile industries of the South hip and thigh, don't try to place the blame on the Republicans or say that they failed to warn you that you were following unsound and disastrous economic policies leading to inevitable ruin. At least forewarned is to be forearmed.

As for me, I am a militant and unrepentant Republican of the school of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt and have represented the congressional district in which the President lives for the past 15 years and am a member of the Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange. I believe in placing my country's welfare above that of my party, and I recognize that the welfare of the Southland and the financial interests of the cotton and textile States and the employment of its people are not local or sectional problems but national issues, affecting the economic well-being of all the American people and the stability of our country.

Recovery under the new deal is a myth and a mirage, backed by propaganda over the radio and billions of dollars out of the Treasury. The failure of the new-deal measures was inevitable, because they were economically unsound, unworkable, and a form of imported state socialism that does not thrive in America. The southern cotton States received a temporary benefit through the Federal Government's attempts to peg cotton prices at 12 cents by use of loans. But the temporary benefits from the unsound new-deal measures have emanated from the "brain trust" pied pipers, Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace and Under Secretary Rexford Guy Tugwell, who are leading the cotton planters on to their financial and economic destruction, and the South along with them. The 25-percent reduction of cotton crops under the dictation of the A. A. A. has increased unemployment in the South and has already brought ruin and misery to the tenant farmers and share-croppers.

The rapidly vanishing foreign markets for our cotton surplus is a direct menace to the well-being and economic interests of all southern cotton States. The situation is far too serious to ignore any longer, and is attributable to the socialistic new-deal policies, which bring havoc and ruin wherever these "brain trust" experiments are tried out. What does it profit the cotton States to have temporary artificial increases in the price of cotton by the manipulations of the A. A. A. and wake up to find that our foreign markets have been lost? Last year our cotton exports declined over 2,000,000 bales, and it is much worse this season. Already our cotton exports have fallen off under 2 years of the new-deal experiments by 50 percent. The Lord only knows what will happen in the next 2 years if these mirages are still pursued.

Encouraged by the 25-percent reduction of cotton and the 12-cent price in the United States, Egypt, Brazil, Soviet Russia, India, China, and North Africa have increased their production by 3,000,000 bales, and are rapidly taking away the world markets from us, which once lost will be difficult to regain. No wonder thoughtful business men in the South are beginning to turn against the new deal when they see ruin staring them in the face.

Increased unemployment, impoverished tenant farmers, more on the relief rolls, and a huge financial and economic loss annually is what the South is facing as the cotton export trade steadily decreases.

The United States exported in normal years approximately 8,000,000 bales of cotton. These exports have declined by more than half, and the tragedy of the situation is that they are dwindling away while the "new dealers" fiddle and zig zag from right to left, but never in any sound direction. The Tugwells and the Ezekiels and the other "brain trusters" are engaged in a dance of death with the cotton planters to the detriment of the South. There is less cotton being exported than at any time since the Civil War, and as a result of the loss of our cotton exports hundreds of thousands of clerks and other employees engaged in ginning, compressing, transporting, shipping, and in warehouses and mills have lost their jobs. Whereas the A. A. A. program of reduction of the cotton crops may help some cotton farmers there are millions of people in the South directly and indirectly adversely affected, as are all consumers.

The southern shipping ports of Charleston, Savannah, Norfolk, Mobile, New Orleans, Memphis, and Galveston are all suffering from the rapid decline in our cotton exports, thanks to the plowing under of crops by the A. A. A. The economy of scarcity and restriction is reaping its own whirlwind of disastrous consequences and evil fruits through importation of shiploads of grain and meat from South America, butter from New Zealand, and cheese from Denmark. I was advised by the Department of Agriculture this morning that since last July 10,000,000 bushels of oats have been imported to compete with the oats produced in the South and Southwest; 8,000,000 bushels of barley, and 7,000,000 bushels of corn, and 6,000,000 bushels of rye. In addition 16,000,000 bushels of wheat have been imported, whereas we have only exported 3,000,000 bushels and the equivalent of 12,000,000 in flour, leaving the United States, unbelievable as it may sound, a net importer of wheat, with the duty at 42 cents—a crop like cotton, which has been reduced by Government regulations.

I am opposed to the governmental policy of restriction and scarcity, when there are 12,000,000 unemployed Americans and 23,000,000 on the relief rolls. If the Government is right, that a policy of producing less makes for wealth and prosperity, then it must follow that producing next to nothing would make us fabulously wealthy. The wand wavers, and magic performers at Washington, in addition to undermining and destroying the principles of Jeffersonian Democracy, will by their costly blunders and crazy-quilt experiments, if continued for 2 more years, ruin and wreck the economic stability of the South more than anything that has happened since the Civil War.

The Republican Party should come out openly and boldly for a square deal for the farmers within the compass of the Constitution, and for an equilibrium of prices between the products of the farms, factories, and mines, which is impossible under the N. R. A. The farmers are entitled to the cost of production plus a reasonable profit, and to the preservation of both the domestic and foreign markets through sound and fair policies and not through lowering or destroying the standards of living and wages of the American people.

In the limited time at my disposal let me discuss briefly another phase of the cotton situation. The textile mills of North and South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama are all being seriously handicapped from the competition of Japanese cotton goods in the Philippines, Colombia, Cuba, Haiti, and Central America. The actual Japanese importations of cotton goods into the United States is taking on alarming proportions and will force the cotton mills of both the North and South to shut down and thereby increase the ranks of the unemployed.

I charge the administration, through the visionary free-trade policies of Secretary of State Hull, with being responsible for helping to wreck and destroy the textile industry of the South, one of its greatest sources of wealth and employment. Already the gross stupidities and blunders of the State Department in a visionary and totally impractical attempt to break down economic barriers throughout the world has sacrificed the textile industry, America's second largest industry, on the altar of free trade to the Japanese.

The time has come to tell the truth and place the responsibility where it belongs—on the shoulders of President Roosevelt and his free-trade Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. It must be self-evident that American labor cannot compete with skilled Japanese labor paid 20 cents a day and operating modern textile plants equipped for mass production. However, Secretary Hull, true to his free-trade principles, and long-distance policies, which will take effect after the southern mills have been destroyed and its labor ruined, is deaf, dumb, and blind to the welfare and interests of the American textile industry, which employs 400,000 industrious and loyal American citizens.

The South is vitally interested and its welfare is at stake. How long will its people continue to remain silent in face of the economic insanity of the administration? To illustrate how far this administration will carry its free-trade policy without regard to the interests of American labor, it turned down 6 months ago an offer of the Philippine Congress to grant adequate protection to American textiles as against Japanese, because it would interfere with the visionary principles and long-distance policies of the administration. Thus we have practically lost, through the inexcusable and almost traitorous action of the State Department, our single greatest export market for our textiles.

Last December Japan controlled 75 percent of the textile imports into the Philippines, and we controlled less than 25 percent, whereas 2 years ago it was just the reverse. Another 6 months of State Department blunders and our Philippine textile trade will be wiped out. What has happened in the Philippines has also taken place in Cuba, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and the rest of Central and South America where we exported previously most of our textile products.

However, that is not the entire story, because Japanese cotton goods are beginning to flood the American market. The following figures showing imports into the United States of Japanese cotton goods speak for themselves:

	Square yards
1933	1,116,000
1934	7,287,000
1935, in January alone	5,000,000

And in February one Japanese ship landed 4,000,000 square yards, and it is estimated that the total for the month will double that of January or exceed the total for 1934. Unless the shipment of Japanese goods into the United States is stopped one textile mill after another in both the North and South will be compelled to shut down, throwing American labor into the ranks of the unemployed.

The people of the South, regardless of party affiliations, do not propose to commit economic suicide for the benefit of the "new

dealers", Secretary Hull, or President Roosevelt. They do not propose to have their legitimate interests sacrificed by Secretary Hull, a free trader and an internationalist, for the benefit of Japan or any other nation.

The textile industry must be afforded adequate protection at home, and both our cotton and textile exports must be given preferences in the bargaining or reciprocal-trade treaties now being negotiated with foreign nations, which, sad to relate, is not being done.

In order to pursue fantastic mirages and nebulous experiments our free-trade crystal-gazers in the State Department have ignored the interests of both the cotton and textile industries, and have thrown them into the limbo of forgotten things to the detriment of free American labor and for the benefit and employment of labor in foreign lands.

The processing taxes imposed by the new-deal administration—I will not honor them with the name Democratic—is nothing but a tariff within the United States, hitherto a free-trade country, within its own boundaries on the necessities of life, and a means of increasing the cost of living for the American people. Shades of John C. Calhoun! To think of his party erecting tariff barriers within the United States against its own people, and refusing to raise a finger to protect our domestic and foreign markets against cheap foreign labor for both our cotton and textile industries employing more American wage earners than any other two of our industries.

There is no party today to speak for Jeffersonian principles except a liberalized Republican Party that will not pussyfoot and compromise with the unsound, socialistic, and destructive features of the "new deal", which affect the welfare, the interests, and the daily lives of every citizen in the Nation, and will not tolerate the weakening of our constitutional and representative form of government.

Our appeal must be made equally to Jeffersonian Democrats and Abraham Lincoln Republicans to uphold and defend the fundamental American principles of government, advocated by both Jefferson and Lincoln, steering clear of socialism, communism, Government ownership, regimentation, collectivism, destructive taxation, and a huge crushing superbureaucracy at Washington.

For well over a hundred years Jeffersonian Democrats have battled for their principles without fear or favor until the advent of this administration and its socialistic and Santa Claus policies. Jeffersonian Democrats for all these years have boldly proclaimed their political creed, which stood for the rights and liberties of the individual citizen under the Constitution, for economy, for State rights, against the centralization and concentration of power in the hands of the Federal Government and the use of such concentrated powers by the Federal Government to interfere with business or the rights and liberties of the individual. Every principle of Jeffersonian Democrats has been repudiated by the administration at Washington and trampled underfoot by the "brain trust", who are not and never have been Democrats.

There is an old story of Abraham Lincoln's that aptly illustrates what has happened in the last 2 years to the principles advocated by Jeffersonian Democrats for over a hundred and thirty-five years. Lincoln said that two men with overcoats on fought so hard that they fought into each other's overcoats. That is what has happened between the Republican and Democratic Parties. The Democratic Party has fought so hard that it has fought itself into the Republican overcoat of centralized government; but, not stopping there, has gone far, far beyond into Government ownership, regimentation, bureaucracy, collectivism, and actual State socialism.

No wonder real Democrats are asking what has happened to their political creed. The answer is that it has been repudiated by the "brain trust" and near-Socialists temporarily in command of the Democratic Party. A liberalized Republican Party stands today much nearer the principles of Jeffersonian Democrats and has a right to appeal to them to cross over a bridge built upon the firm foundation of the rights and liberties of the individual and the Constitution of the United States, in order to oust the present administration that has ignored State's rights and all but destroyed representative government, by erecting a gigantic, costly, and tyrannical bureaucracy at Washington to regiment the daily lives of 125,000,000 free Americans.

Let us build a bridge so that millions of deceived, disgruntled, and disgusted Jeffersonian Democrats may cross over to a liberalized Republican Party in 1936 and help elect a Republican President in order to oust the socialistic new-deal administration at Washington and save and preserve the principles of Thomas Jefferson from destruction by those within the Democratic Party who are now following false political leaders and doctrines, most of which are foreign to American ideals and a democratic form of government.

I have often been asked what kind of a platform the Republicans propose, and my answer to that is we could well take a large part of the last Democratic platform, especially those planks that have been thrown overboard, such as a 25-percent reduction in the running expenses of the Government, a balanced Budget, sound money to be preserved at all hazards, a reduction in the number of commissions, to stop borrowing and to stop deficits, and, in addition, a drastic modification of the N. R. A. and the A. A. A.

THE PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE IN CONNECTION WITH THE BONUS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the fact that on last Thursday, March 21, the House of Representatives voted to substitute the Patman bill for the Vinson bill by a vote of 202 to 191, and that on the next day the House voted again on practically the same subject by a vote of 207 to 204 has caused much confusion in the minds of many who follow the proceedings of Congress. Believing that is of sufficient importance to justify an explanation, I arise to explain it briefly.

All bonus bills are referred to the Ways and Means Committee for consideration. This committee recommended the passage of the Vinson bill, thereby placing it on the calendar for consideration in its turn. In order to have a bill considered out of its turn it is necessary to pass a special rule. The Rules Committee offered a resolution to that effect, which was adopted. This special rule provided for the immediate consideration of the Vinson bill and that after 10 hours of debate it should be acted upon. And if Mr. PATMAN or others, who had introduced bonus bills, wished to offer their bills as substitutes for the Vinson bill they could do so. Mr. PATMAN offered his bill as a substitute on Thursday. A vote was had, and the Patman bill was substituted for the Vinson bill by a vote of 202 to 191. The House then adjourned.

The special rule also provided, as is the usual custom, that after a bill had been accepted by the House, a motion might be made to recommit that bill to the Ways and Means Committee again for consideration, with instructions. On Friday when Congress convened Mr. VINSON moved to recommit the Patman bill to the committee with instructions to report back forthwith substituting the Vinson bill for the Patman bill. A vote was had, and Congress refused to recommit, by a vote of 207 to 204. Thus the Vinson bill was defeated again. This was a very close vote. The vote would have been 204 for the Patman bill and 205 for the Vinson bill except for the fact that two Members who had declined to vote when this motion was called asked permission to vote for the Patman bill, raising that vote to 206, and except that another Member who had voted for the Vinson bill changed to the Patman bill, reducing the Vinson vote to 204 and increasing the Patman vote to 207.

After the failure to substitute the Vinson bill an attempt was made to substitute the Tydings bill for the Patman bill. This lost by 319 to 82. I voted for the Patman bill.

After both motions to recommit had failed the matter then came up on its final passage. The question was whether the House would accept the Patman bill or whether it would reject any bonus bill. The Patman bill was accepted by a vote of 318 to 90. I voted for the Patman bill.

Although I preferred the Vinson plan, yet when it was defeated I voted for the Patman plan on its final passage, as I feel that the important thing is to pay the bonus.

The special rule allowed for the consideration of this matter was probably more liberal and wide open than any rule ever granted by the House for any important measure. This fact, together with the fact that the same question was voted on twice on succeeding days, and that the results were so close and were changed by last minute changes of votes, makes this contest stand out as a high light in the history of Congress from a parliamentary standpoint.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a bill that I have introduced and tables showing the benefits to the respective States operating under the bill if it was enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, how long are those tables?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Short tables. I am going to explain them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Upon what subject?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. To authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts in the several States for the purpose of assisting and enabling them to refinance their outstanding bonded indebtedness, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on February 27 I introduced House bill 6227, a copy of which is as follows:

A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts in the several States for the purpose of assisting and enabling such counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts to reduce and refinance their outstanding bonded indebtedness, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress considers the present economic condition to be in part the consequence of the issuance of a large amount of bonds on the part of counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts, bearing a high rate of interest, necessitating high tax levies annually, which has largely destroyed the true value of farms and other real estate, and has caused the sale of many homes because of the inability of the owners to pay the high taxes levied thereon, all of which has combined to impair our national economic security. It is, therefore, declared that these conditions are of national public interest and render imperative the immediate enactment of remedial legislation whereby land values will be restored, the purchasing power of our people increased, and homes saved from tax sales.

SEC. 2. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized, empowered, and directed to make loans, as hereinafter provided, in an aggregate amount of $1,000,000,000 to counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts legally existing in the several States of the United States for the purpose of assisting and enabling such counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts to reduce and refinance their outstanding bonded indebtedness. The term of any such loan shall not exceed 40 years, and the rate of interest payable by any county, parish, road district, and/or school district to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for such loan shall not exceed 3 percent per annum.

SEC. 3. The word "division" when hereinafter used in this act shall mean any county and/or parish and/or road district and/or school district legally existing in the several States of the United States.

SEC. 4. The total sum of money to be available to the divisions in any one State shall be that percentage of the total amount authorized to be loaned herein as is the percentage of the total bonded indebtedness of the entire number of such divisions in that State when compared to the total bonded indebtedness of all such divisions in the United States. The total sum of money to be available to any one division shall be that percentage of the total amount available to the State in which same is situated as is the percentage of the total bonded indebtedness of the particular division compared to the total bonded indebtedness of all divisions in that State.

SEC. 5. Before any division shall be eligible to receive a loan under the terms of this act, the proper constituted authorities of the particular division making application for a loan shall contract, in the manner provided by the rules and regulations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made in accordance with the provisions of this act, to use the money received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of retiring such amounts of the outstanding bonds of the district as the sum of the loan is sufficient to call in. The bonds of any division which are past due and unpaid together with those bonds that would cost the division the largest sum of money in interest charges as computed to the date of maturity shall be the first issue or issues chosen for retirement.

SEC. 6. No loan shall be made under the provisions of this act until the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been satisfied that an agreement has been entered into between the division and the holders of its outstanding bonds whereby the division will be able to purchase or refund such bonds at a price determined by the Corporation to be reasonable after taking into consideration the average market price of such bonds over the 6 months' period ending January 1, 1935, but this provision shall not apply to divisions having legal option under the laws of its State to recall its outstanding bonds at will when the division desires to exercise such option.

SEC. 7. Upon the approval of any loan to any division such division shall issue and deliver its refunding bond or bonds to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the amount of said loan and shall also agree not to issue any other bonds while said refunding bond or bonds or any part thereof are outstanding unless with the consent and approval of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SEC. 8. When any division shall begin repaying the money loaned to it by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under the provisions of this act, together with the interest due thereon, said sums so repaid shall constitute a revolving fund to be used for additional loans to divisions in compliance with the provisions of this act: *Provided, however,* That all current interest obligations and expenses chargeable against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on account of this act shall first be paid out of any moneys so repaid before any additional loans shall be made.

SEC. 9. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and empowered to make such rules and regulations, employ such personnel, and do such other acts as may be necessary for the administration of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to have outstanding at any one time under section 9 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is increased by the sum of $1,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am prompted to make this appeal for the favorable consideration of this bill because I can appreciate the very necessary relief that its enactment would bring to the overburdened taxpayers of the counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts of the entire United States.

Every person who is aware of the problems of today knows that the high rate of taxation paid by home owners and property owners was one of the chief causes for the coming of the depression. The continuation of this evil is a big factor that enables the depression to persist in spreading economic havoc from one side of the country to the other, uniformly scattering financial distress everywhere. This is true because high county and district taxes have helped to destroy the true value of farms and other real estate, have caused the sale of homes, and have limited the income of all our citizens alike.

It is common knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that it is not Federal and State government taxation that is grinding down our citizens to the point of hopelessness. That is not the chief source of our troubles. County and district taxation that is so high as to be almost unpayable has been causing the loss of our homes and other concurrent evils. That is the situation that is in such urgent need of remedy.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is briefly, yet fully set out in the title, which declares that the bill is "to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts in the several States for the purpose of assisting and enabling such counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts to reduce and refinance their outstanding bonded indebtedness."

Our voters are well acquainted with the situation prevalent in every county, in every road district, and in every school district in this country. The bonded indebtedness of each and every one of them is enormous. The interest rate paid by the taxpayers on these bonds is not only high but it is extremely excessive, being in the neighborhood of 6 percent all over the country.

On the other hand, we see the Federal Government able, because of its immense resources, to obtain funds at rates lower than 3 percent. It is unnecessary and it is wrong for the local citizen, because of the limited resources of his locality, to have to pay 6 percent interest on his bonded indebtedness, when the Federal Government, at present engaged in so many beneficent enterprises at its own expense, could remedy the situation at no expense at all. It would be necessary to do nothing but extend the funds to the localities supported by their own credit and in no way lessening or attacking the stability of the credit of the Federal Government.

If the localities under discussion had sufficient funds they could at will recall at least a large part of those bonds on which they are now paying such large sums in interest charges. The United States Government could make this money available to them at less than 3 percent. Money at 3 percent instead of 6 percent would mean an annual saving of 3 percent to the taxpayers.

The total bonded indebtedness of all the counties, road districts, and school districts in the United States is over $6,000,000,000, as based on figures for the year 1932. Six billion dollars is such a tremendous sum that we cannot refund the entire amount, but there is no reason for not taking a very important step in the right direction and making a billion dollars available for refunding one-sixth of these obligations, and taking $30,000,000 a year from the big bondholders and leaving it in the hands of our substantial citizens who are staggering under an unnecessary tax burden and who are

losing their homes by foreclosure and tax sales because of excessive taxation.

My bill proposes to extend the lending power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by $1,000,000,000 to enable it to secure the necessary funds to be extended to the local divisions for the refunding of their bonds that now carry such heavy interest charges. The bill specifically provides that those bond issues that now carry the highest interest charges shall be the first chosen for retirement, thus making the available funds do the most good when used.

The method by which the billion dollars would be distributed is absolutely fair and impartial. There is no possibility of favoritism, because distribution will be determined on a pro rata basis. Statistical experts of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will determine the total bonded indebtedness of all the counties, road districts, and school districts in each particular State of the Union. When that has been accomplished, the total for the entire United States will be fixed. Then each State will have allotted to its counties, road districts, and school districts such portion of the billion-dollar fund as its indebtedness compares to the total like indebtedness of the United States. This will guarantee that each State will have help according to its needs as demonstrated by its outstanding bonded indebtedness, and this will be the only standard governing the distribution of the funds. The States that most need the relief will receive such percentage of help as their needs entitle them to. There will be no question of each State's getting its share as mathematically determined by a fair rule.

The same rule that applies to distribution to States will apply to distribution to the various localities after the quota for the State has been determined, thus assuring the same fair, equitable distribution. My friends, there will not be a taxpayer in the whole United States that this bill will fail to reach, however completely forgotten he may think himself to be. Everyone will receive the same measure of relief, gaged by the need of help.

Mr. Speaker, a few critics of this legislation have declared that the credit of the United States Government is already so greatly overworked that it could not afford to take on $1,000,000,000 in additional obligations and that it must not be put to any additional expense. There will be no expense to the Federal Government involved in this bill and the net obligations of the country as a whole will not be increased. There will be a scaling down of interest charges. Every bond issued by the Federal Government to secure funds for this proposal will be supported by a bond of similar amount from the locality receiving the benefit. The bonds issued to the Federal Government by the local divisions will be supported by the taxing power of those divisions, thereby guaranteeing their value. It will be merely an exchange of bond for bond, but the new bonds on the locality, aided by the United States, will carry a rate of 3 percent instead of 6, as formerly, and therein will be found the $30,000,000 saving, the difference of 3 percent on an amount of $1,000,000,000.

Today we see the United States Government borrowing billions of dollars and in turn lending it to the home owners through the agency of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and to the farmers through the Federal land banks and by seed loans. The Federal Housing Administration is engaged in guaranteeing mortgages on homes, this being done to prevent foreclosures. I approve all of this, for it is being done by the Administration as an attempt to safeguard property and the home as the basic institutions of this country. These huge sums are being loaned and have been loaned in an effort to cultivate and maintain the desire for property and a home, a desire that is common to all and which is the fundamental unit upon which civilization itself is based. All of these past efforts are good, and I am happy to endorse them so far as they go, but we must pass some legislation that will enable our people to keep their homes after the Federal Government has made these large sums available. In this connection I repeat the truism that excessive local taxation is the most dangerous existing menace to the continued and successful ownership of homes and property in this country. The principles of sound business dictate that if the Government desires to protect the sums it has already advanced it should see that high local taxes are reduced. They will be reduced if the bill which I have introduced is enacted into a law and the Government makes the sum available that I am seeking, for the resulting $30,000,000 saving will go a long way toward guaranteeing the success of the efforts we have put forth through the establishment and operation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and similar agencies. Many a home and many a piece of property will be made safe for the owner. Furthermore, it will be much easier for those who do not have a home to acquire one if the specter of unreasonable, unnecessary taxation does not haunt them every step of the way toward the realization of ownership.

What caused our people to be under the necessity of obtaining help from the Federal Government in the first place? It is beyond question that the burden of unreasonable local taxation was one of the major causes. It is folly not to remedy this situation, because failure to correct it will mean that the load on the Federal Government will become heavier and heavier instead of decreasing. The loans that have already been advanced will not be sufficiently protected. If $1,000,000,000 were made available to the counties, road districts, and school districts at 3 percent, and they used it to retire bonds that now carry an interest rate of 6 percent and over, they would save $30,000,000 annually while repaying the money to the Federal Treasury. The Federal Government, instead of losing anything, would be doing a great deal to protect money already advanced and would save many homes.

The Government has already made tremendous loans through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to railroads, banks, and industries to help them carry on. If these large sums can be made available to one portion of our citizenry, certainly the taxpayers should receive some help. If the load were taken off their backs, they could help some of the enterprises that are forced to rely on the Government.

Let me remind you that this is not a temporary plan. In addition to meeting an emergency situation, the bill provides for a revolving fund to be established from the funds paid into the Treasury by the divisions when they discharge their obligations, and this money is to be used for the purpose of continuing this undertaking until lasting benefit has been brought to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the soundness of the principle of this bill has already been approved by Congress and the President in extending aid to drainage districts. I ask that we extend the principle in the manner I have described in order that tax relief may be secured. There is no reason to prevent its being done. Courage has been the outstanding characteristic of the new deal, but no courage should be required for the passage of this bill. Its practicality cannot be questioned; its benefits are certain. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the following table will show the estimated approximate benefits that will come to the taxpayers of each State if Congress will enact H. R. 6227 into law.

Estimated approximate amounts that will be made available in each State of the Union under the operation of H. R. 6227, as taken from 1932 figures of the Census Bureau, together with estimated savings in interest charges to the taxpayers in each State where the present interest rates are 6 percent on the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the counties, road districts, and school districts

State	Amount of loan to each State	Annual saving in interest charges to each State
Alabama	$7,200,000	$216,000
Arizona	7,700,000	231,000
Arkansas	13,400,000	402,000
California	75,400,000	2,262,000
Colorado	9,900,000	297,000
Connecticut	9,000,000	270,000
Delaware	1,700,000	51,000
Florida	45,500,000	1,365,000
Georgia	8,400,000	252,000
Idaho	9,500,000	285,000
Illinois	91,100,000	2,733,000
Indiana	23,100,000	693,000
Iowa	29,200,000	876,000
Kansas	10,300,000	309,000
Kentucky	7,000,000	210,000

Estimated approximate amounts that will be made available in each State of the Union under the operation of H. R. 6227, as taken from 1932 figures of the Census Bureau, together with estimated savings in interest charges to the taxpayers in each State where the present interest rates are 6 percent on the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the counties, road districts, and school districts—Continued

State	Amount of loan to each State	Annual saving in interest charges to each State
Louisiana	$30,000,000	$900,000
Maine	3,400,000	102,000
Maryland	7,800,000	234,000
Massachusetts	2,200,000	66,000
Michigan	31,200,000	936,000
Minnesota	18,000,000	540,000
Mississippi	15,700,000	471,000
Missouri	17,800,000	534,000
Montana	7,200,000	216,000
Nebraska	9,000,000	270,000
Nevada	1,000,000	30,000
New Hampshire	1,900,000	57,000
New Jersey	60,000,000	1,800,000
New Mexico	1,500,000	45,000
New York	85,600,000	2,568,000
North Carolina	31,900,000	957,000
North Dakota	3,200,000	96,000
Ohio	66,100,000	1,983,000
Oklahoma	16,000,000	480,000
Oregon	13,700,000	411,000
Pennsylvania	78,000,000	2,340,000
Rhode Island	100,000	3,000
South Carolina	8,500,000	255,000
South Dakota	4,000,000	120,000
Tennessee	17,200,000	516,000
Texas	70,000,000	2,100,000
Utah	3,400,000	102,000
Vermont	1,400,000	42,000
Virginia	5,200,000	156,000
Washington	13,000,000	390,000
West Virginia	7,800,000	234,000
Wisconsin	15,000,000	450,000
Wyoming	4,800,000	144,000
Total	1,000,000,000	30,000,000

THE NEW AIR MAIL BILL

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the new air mail legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, every well-informed supporter of air mail legislation will find cause for deep gratification in being given the opportunity to support the bill H. R. 6511, introduced by the Chairman of the Post Office Committee [Mr. MEAD]. This bill amends the present temporary air mail legislation and makes definite and important improvements as regards the regulation and compensation of the air mail carriers. The aircraft industry in America has set up an operating system which has become the envy of the rest of the world and should properly be extended a badly needed helping hand. The problem of protecting the industry is recognized as a vital one.

The Mead bill empowers the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates and to increase them up to a maximum of 20 percent above those in existing law.

Under this provision rates up to 48 cents an airplane-mile for the transportation of mail loads in excess of 300 pounds and 38 cents a mile for loads of 300 pounds or less may be fixed. That this is moderate compensation is evident when it is realized that it cost the Post Office Department $2.21 a mile to have the mail transported by the Army. The bill further makes the rate-of-pay findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission effective as of March 1, 1935, and thus gives promise of prompt financial relief, which is imperatively needed by the industry, in view of the fact that some companies have only sufficient funds to carry on for a few weeks or months, and that even the largest are rapidly depleting their cash reserves while operating at the sacrificial rates bid only to retain the territory which they had pioneered.

The bill further takes a long step toward preventing the paralleling of existing air mail routes, which must depend for revenue to an important degree on passenger and express receipts by lines not having an air mail contract on those routes. It also removes the power of cancelation of contracts from the Postmaster General and vests it in the Interstate Commerce Commisson after due hearing. The bill thus virtually establishes certificates of convenience and necessity, taking a step toward permanency in the business which has been lacking heretofore.

The bill contains many improvements over the air mail bill passed in the Seventy-third Congress; it affords protection to the public and has the approval of a majority of the air lines; leaves responsibility, administration, and decision where those things properly belong, and should go a long way toward the improvement of the distressed condition which threatens the air transport system of the country.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I desire to make a statement clarifying the erroneous impression which seems to exist on the minority side of the House through statements that have been made by members of the minority party, because they intimate that lobbyists, including Mr. Elliott Roosevelt, the son of the President, have lobbied for this legislation. This is an absolutely untrue statement and could be expected to come only from false-hearted men, or from one who is woefully misinformed.

I am most reliably informed that neither the President's son nor any member of his family have ever contacted a single member of the Post Office Committee in behalf of this legislation, nor has young Mr. Roosevelt or any member of his family approached the Post Office Department in this connection.

My informant, for whom I have the very highest regard, advised me that the President's son is not engaged in any way in any business that has to do with the carriage of air mail. I have learned, however, that his services have been engaged by a number of transport lines, as a technical advisor and arbitrator, and has to do with express and passenger business only.

His duties require him to travel considerably; he employs a secretary and a stenographer; his expenses, including the salaries paid his employees, are all borne by himself; and his own salary is comparable to that of any man employed in a similar capacity. These attacks upon the Chief Executive and his family are unworthy of the gentleman who gave voice to them and are wholly unwarranted and unjustified.

It is my understanding that Mr. Elliott Roosevelt has never attempted to intercede in any matters dealing with the Post Office Department; in fact, so far as my informant has been able to ascertain, he has never been in the Post Office Building.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR RELIEF (H. J. RES. 117)

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 174, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 174

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 117, with Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table; that the Senate amendments be, and they are hereby, disagreed to by the House; that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the said joint resolution be, and hereby is, agreed to by the House; that the Speaker shall immediately appoint managers on the part of the House without intervening motion; and that the managers on the part of the House are hereby given specific authority to agree, with or without amendment, or disagree to any amendment of the Senate to the said joint resolution notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XX.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, this rule is not subject to amendment at present; but if we should vote down the previous question on the rule, then the rule would be open to amendment, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER. To any germane amendment, that is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman does that, let us have an understanding about how the time is going to be divided.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Under the usual practice, I yield 30 minutes to the minority member of the Committee on Rules, to yield as he sees fit. That leaves 30 minutes on this side to be yielded.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, when the gentleman speaks of the minority, he refers to the political minority, the Republican organization. We represent a group which we think is in the majority opposing the adoption of this rule. I want to know how much of that time is going to be allotted to us who oppose the adoption of the rule.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, I have no idea what the minority party is going to do. On this side I have many requests for time. Until a Member speaks I have no way of knowing whether he is for the resolution or opposed. I have the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], for instance, heading the list.

Mr. RANKIN. I think there is at least one member of the Committee on Rules who is opposed to this rule—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understand that gentleman has time.

Mr. RANKIN. But does he have time to yield to other Members who are opposed to the rule?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; that is never done. That is not in accord with the rules of the House to yield to a Member to yield to others.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me an arrangement should be made whereby 50 percent of this time would go to the members of this House who are opposed to this rule. I want to know if they are going to yield just to two or three of us and then take up the rest of the time in favor of the rule. If that is so, I submit it is hardly fair to the Membership of the House.

The SPEAKER. That is a question that the Chair cannot answer.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to know from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] whether they are going to yield time to Members who are opposed to the rule. I ask if the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York, the Chairman of the Committee on Rules, will not agree to yield to the Members who are opposed to the adoption of this rule one-half of the time?

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have already agreed to yield 5 minutes to the only one who is known to me as a "silverite" requesting time. I cannot yield time unless Members of the House come to me and make the request. All of my time is now allotted.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Will not the gentleman withhold that for a moment to let me ask the gentleman from New York a question?

Mr. MILLARD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. While I intend to vote for the rule to send the bill to conference, the Democrats on this side of the aisle who see fit to oppose the rule, ought not to be forced to go to the other side of the aisle for time where they are opposed to any rule. I think the organization and the Democratic leadership on our Rules Committee ought to always make it possible for men of our own party to get time from our own side of the aisle.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman surely understands that the Democrats have 10 Members on the Committee on Rules, among whom 30 minutes is to be divided, while the minority party has only four Members on that committee with 30 minutes to be divided among them.

Mr. BLANTON. But we have a Texas Democrat on the Rules Committee [Mr. DIES] who is opposed to this rule. A certain amount of time ought to be assigned to the members of the Rules Committee who are opposing this resolution. All of the hour should not be controlled by proponents of the rule. I understand that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and possibly another Democrat on the Rules Committee are both opposed to the rule.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have no such knowledge, and all I can say is that I have allotted time in opposition to the rule to every request that has been made of me. I do not know what all this fuss is about.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. When the gentleman says that he has allotted time to all Members who have requested time, I assume that he refers to the list that I gave him?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, sir; partially.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. That list was made up on the granting of only 10 minutes' time. We allotted that to four Members, while the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was given 5 minutes by the minority, making 15 minutes all told.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman will appreciate that the Rules Committee is bringing in a rule and that we have 10 Democratic members on the Rules Committee. Surely the custom in this House is that members of the reporting committee have prior recognition. I will say to the gentleman that those four requests are in behalf of Members of the House who are not members of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. What I want to make clear is this, that that 10 minutes represents all the time we could get by consent.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As to this side of the aisle, that is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Why not ask unanimous consent for an extension of time of a half an hour and give it to those opposed to the resolution. I am for the resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is agreeable to me and was my intention.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is right. Let us be fair. I am with the gentleman from New York, but I think the opposition should have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield for me to make the request?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I prefer to make it myself as I intended, because this request does not come as anything new. We had an understanding on both sides of the aisle that if there was demand for more time, I would make a request for additional time.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not know that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have had a lot of excitement about nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for consideration of the rule be extended 30 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. With the understanding that that 30 minutes is to be yielded to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who represents the opposition to the resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I can make no such agreement.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman wants to be fair with us, he will agree to give us this 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has the floor.

Mr. RANKIN. But I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has been recognized to present the rule. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I did ask unanimous consent to extend the time on the rule 30 minutes in spite of all this unreasonable talk about being "fair"—a bromide too often used in this House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time be extended 30 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, the gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time be extended for 30 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Do we get our half?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Surely.

The SPEAKER. One-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] and one-half by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, is there objection?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I would like to ask how much time the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has consumed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not consumed any time. This discussion was under a reservation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to the adoption of this rule to send this bill to conference, for the simple reason that we want the Senate amendments adopted. If this bill is sent to conference, we have notice served from the other end of the Capitol that no matter what change is made, when it comes back from conference it will be debated indefinitely in the Senate.

So we are asking you to vote down the previous question on the rule, so that we may amend it and adopt the Senate amendments.

I know those amendments will be attacked. They were attacked yesterday. We were told that certain Members in control of this legislation did not care what some of us thought, but in my humble opinion the Senate has greatly improved this measure. When you talk about the ability of a committee of the House to straighten out legislation, I call attention to the fact that at the other end of the Capitol there are 96 Members who are just about as able, taken as a whole, as the membership of this House.

We were told when this bill was passed by the House that they were in a terrific hurry. They did not give us time to debate the bill and put on amendments that many of us would like to have supported. They hurried it through. It went through the House and went to the Senate and it was debated there for 2 solid months. Now they come here, because they want to get rid of certain amendments, and intimate that those amendments would destroy the bill. They are not appropriation amendments. They are legislative amendments that the House has jurisdiction to pass upon. Now they want to take it to conference and take out some of those amendments which are already proving to be beneficial.

I know there are men here who do not want any expansion, who do not want any liberalization of our financial structure, but they cannot deny the fact that since this silver amendment was adopted in the Senate, there has been a steady rise in commodity prices throughout the country.

Nothing, in my opinion, that has been done at this session of Congress will do the American people more good than to accept these amendments en bloc and send this bill to the President at once. That is the reason we are making our fight. It is not pleasant for us, we men who have been gagged, as it were, here for months; it is not pleasant to have to fight against the well-organized machine, but we are fighting the battles of the American people because we believe that if this bill is passed in its present form and sent to the other end of the Avenue and signed at once it will do more toward starting this country back on the path of recovery than anything that has been passed at this session of Congress.

For these reasons we are opposing this rule. We are going to vote against the previous question. If the previous question is voted down it gives us the right to move to amend the rule so as to accept these amendments en bloc, or to accept them one at a time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate placed on House Joint Resolution 117, 30 amendments, many of them impractical of administration, which will hamper the President in giving us an efficient administration of the vast sum appropriated.

If I had the time I could demonstrate beyond question that the bill as it has been amended by the Senate is impractical of efficient administration in many respects. I could demonstrate to you beyond question that even the allotment made for specific objects is useless, for the money is not available under the law for expenditure for those objects. I could demonstrate to you beyond question that when they make an allotment of $40,000,000 for schools, that it is less than the schools will get under another amendment if properly arranged which will be of more value in giving employment in the school system. I could demonstrate to you beyond question how unfeasible is the authorization that this money shall be available for the A. A. A., the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The whole amount is available for that; the entire $4,880,000,000 is available under Senate amendments. The Secretary of Agriculture does not want it, he does not need it; and this amendment makes no mention of and no provision for reduction of processing taxes or elimination of processing taxes. In other words, the processing tax goes on for the support of the A. A. A. and this Senate amendment authorizes the expenditure of any amount of this appropriation also to conduct the A. A. A. Why not just turn the whole blamed business over to the A. A. A. and be done with it? That is one point.

I am not going to discuss the silver amendment, but an analysis of section 4 of the amendment shows that it vests the greatest arbitrary power in a Cabinet officer that has ever been vested by act of Congress. It gives him the power to make settlements on agreed prices for silver in satisfaction of any balances due the United States, foreign or domestic; yet they want to swallow section 4 of the silver amendment.

Another objectionable amendment is one stating that the men designated by the President or appointed by the President as personnel cannot discharge their duties or receive their salaries until confirmed by the mighty Senate, giving to the Senate an ax over the allocation of these funds; and what chance would any Member of this House have under such conditions and circumstances?

Another Senate amendment provides for classification, by means of which every employee will have to be classified before he can enter on the discharge of his duties, and even employees already in the Government service will have to be classified. Throughout, the positions created under this bill will have to be classified first, and this will take months and months.

The Senate added a road amendment. I will bet there are not 10 men in this House who can tell what it means. The road amendment appropriates even for the authorized appropriation that we carried in our agricultural bill that passed the House the other day. It provides for such a peculiar allocation of this fund that it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to tell how much this State or that State will receive.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Senate has adopted an amendment with regard to railroad crossings which allocates money for the elimination of crossings upon a certain rule laid down in the bill. This rule does not recognize the number of railroad crossings in the centers of population

and dense traffic, but takes them on a general population basis, road area, railroad mileage, and includes highways in Hawaii. Has Hawaii any railroad crossings at all? If so, I never saw one in that Territory. There are a few little railroads there, sugarcane roads, freight railroads, if you please, yet a vast amount of this money would be frozen until 1937, allocated under that road amendment to Hawaii.

Oh, yes, you fine Members are willing to swallow every one of these impractical and wrong amendments merely for the sake of getting the silver amendment the Senate tacked onto this bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make this statement: I am not set for or against any amendment in this bill. I am holding an open mind to go to conference as a conferee should go, to adjust these amendments, agree to such amendments of the Senate as are practical, or amend Senate amendments in such a way as to give us an efficient administration of the bill and give the President an opportunity to bring about the great results he contemplates under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the bill should go to conference to be systematized. Additional amendments should be suggested and adopted, because the bill is impractical.

If left like it is, it will hamper the administration to a certain extent, and may mean the difference between failure and success of this appropriation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side of the House who are supporting the resolution are not interested in any factional warfare that may be raging over on the other side; neither do we by our vote give approval to the measure which is pending before the House. We are simply supporting the rule because we believe a great question like this, involving nearly $5,000,000,000, should be considered in the regular, orderly, and usual way. Bills invariably are referred to the conferees for their examination and consideration before being acted upon in the House. For this reason we are supporting the rule which upholds the usual procedure.

Mr. Speaker, no one sacrifices any rights he may have in sending this bill to conference as provided under the rule. All the amendments in this bill must eventually come back to the House, and ultimately the majority of the House will prevail. I am in favor of some of these amendments. For instance, I would like to have the House concur immediately in the amendment offered by Senator GEORGE, of Georgia. I believe it is a real relief amendment and one which would bring genuine relief to hundreds of thousands of workers in the textile industry, who, unless they do get relief from the processing tax, will be unable to find work. Many mills are being forced out of business because of this tax. However, I am willing to have this great problem considered by the conferees. I am willing to have their judgment, and then I am going to reserve the right, when they bring back the legislation, to insist upon the amendment. We are not afraid of an inquiry into the merits of our cause. I repeat I believe there is no justification to depart from the usual procedure and consequently will support the rule.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, it is our purpose to vote against the previous question in order to enable the House to vote on the question of whether or not they want to concur in all of the Senate amendments in gross. If the House does not want to concur in all these Senate amendments in gross, then by voting down the rule the bill goes back to the Appropriations Committee; the Appropriations Committee reports on it, and the bill comes back to the House in order to give the Members of the House an opportunity to pass on these amendments. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the Senate had 8 weeks in which to consider this legislation, and yet the House is expected to delegate the authority to five conferees to go into conference and decide upon questions that this House and this House alone is entitled to decide upon. There is no use for us to deceive ourselves. The conferees are not going to agree to these amendments and the Senate conferees are not going to agree to them. If you are in favor of the amendments giving $40,000,000 to the schools, allocating $800,000,000 to roads and grade crossings, $350,000,000 to rivers and harbors, and $500,000,000 for soil erosion, irrigation, and drainage; if you favor the establishment of a principle by which the President may be guided in accordance with the Supreme Court's decision in the Amazon case; to chart his course without taking all discretion away from him, you will vote down the previous question. We will thereby say to the President: "Within this chartered course you may act." If we want to assume our constitutional responsibility, why hazard it by sending this bill to conference?

Mr. Speaker, for a long time we have been legislating by delegating authority. The Senate has been more deliberative than we have. The Senate has taken its own time. We have been asked time and time again to enact legislation in a period of 1 hour. Then the bill goes to the Senate, and the Senate adds a lot of amendments and we send it to conference. The conferees disagree. The Senate then says to the country: "We wanted to help the people, but the House of Representatives would not permit us to do so."

It seems to me that the question is squarely up to the Members of this House right now. If we favor these beneficial amendments, we ought to give the House an opportunity to concur. If we are not in favor of concurring in all the amendments, then why not vote down the rule and send it back to the Appropriations Committee? Let it come back to this great body again. Shall we sacrifice our dignity, our power, and our prerogatives? [Applause.]

There is not anyone that can say that the President is opposed to this bill. Conferences were held between the White House and the Senate during its progress. Not one man can say that the President will veto this measure. Why should we be asked to delegate our authority when the other body is proceeding under its constitutional power and giving to these matters careful consideration? Only this morning I saw a statement of the president of the Parent Teachers Association and the head of the Y. W. C. A. saying that unless this $40,000,000 appropriation is made available immediately schools will continue to close all over the country. They are closing down now. In a few weeks the C. C. C. camps will cease to exist. These amendments authorize the President to rehabilitate the stricken agricultural areas and to establish tenant farmers upon their own farms. Will we permit the C. C. C. camps to close?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In 1 more week.

Mr. DIES. Yes; in 1 more week. Relief is needed all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, a bloc has been formed in the Senate, according to the morning paper, and this bloc, according to their statement, will filibuster for 2 months or more if we do not act now upon these amendments. Are you in favor of chartering the course of the Executive? Do you think it is unreasonable for Congress to put some limitation, to direct a chartered course, to prescribe some rules to guide the President in accordance with the Supreme Court's decision in the Amazon case?

Whether we prevail or not, it is our effort to give Members of the House the full opportunity to say what you want to do with the Senate amendments. If you do not want to concur in all of them, by voting down the rule you can send the bill to the Appropriations Committee, bring it back on the floor, and let this legislative body that formerly was the greatest body on the face of the earth pass upon them. In view of the limited time allotted to me, I may extend my remarks at some later time to set forth the many reasons why we should afford the House an opportunity to pass upon these amendments and insure the immediate passage of this bill in constitutional form and with beneficial and constructive provisions. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members who speak may have permission to revise and extend their

remarks, and also that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am for this rule because I want to send the bill to conference and take advantage of the amendments that have been made by the Senate that are good and throw out the amendments of the Senate that are bad and will not work.

The bill is bad enough anyway. [Applause.] I do not want to see it made worse by the adoption of the amendments of the Senate that are bad, and, frankly, I believe that the inflation amendment that was put in the bill is bad.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Does not the gentleman believe that the amendment will be perfectly safe in the hands of the present Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. TABER. No, I do not. I have not the confidence in him that some of you folks who want to see a lot of paper money printed seem to have.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. If the gentleman will look up his record during the past 2 years I am sure he will conclude that he is perfectly safe.

Mr. TABER. Not when they have cut the dollar about in two.

This is the same bill that we had before the House of Representatives a couple of months ago, away back in January.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is the same bill which, at that time, had to be passed in 48 hours or the country would not have any relief money.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and there is only $300,000,000 available now for relief money after taking care of relief all this time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman honestly think this is the most atrocious and abominable measure ever presented to a legislative body?

Mr. TABER. It is perfectly ridiculous. [Laughter and applause.] It is not a work relief bill, and I am going to demonstrate this.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman feel that it is a slush fund?

Mr. TABER. Yes; it is.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield now. I will yield in a moment.

This bill is not a work-relief bill. When the message came up here from the President of the United States we were told that he would be able to put 3,500,000 men to work by July 1. The actual fact is that the only item they have in contemplation that will provide any substantial employment is the highway item, which cannot be functioning at all before the 1st of October and cannot be functioning generally before the 1st of January next year, and most of it will take 15 months to be put in operation.

This is a bad bill from beginning to end; except for the direct relief that is contained in it, it is a fraud on the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman when he speaks of the highway item functioning by the 1st of October or the 1st of January, does he not mean that the contracts will be let at about that time?

Mr. TABER. The contracts will be let in about that time and they will get to work in full blast perhaps a year and a half from now.

Mr. SHORT. And then the contracts are not to be let to private contractors but performed by hired day labor.

Mr. TABER. And insofar as they are performed by hired day labor it will be a waste and destruction of the people's money, with nothing to show for it.

Mr. SHORT. I agree with the gentleman absolutely.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is there any provision in the bill for taking care of the Democratic deficit of 1934?

Mr. TABER. I do not know how they are going to be able to work that, but, maybe, it is kind of covered up like, you know.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me now for a question?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he voted against the bill on its passage when it was before the House?

Mr. TABER. Oh, certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. Some Members on the gentleman's side of the House asked that this money be allocated or that some limitations be put on the allocation of it. I was one of the men who agreed to that proposition, and now the Senate has put it in the bill.

Mr. TABER. I am going to read those allocations, so the House will know what kind of fake it is.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman believe that that improves the bill?

Mr. TABER. Eight hundred million dollars for roads, which is the only item that might, perhaps, bring some work relief and that one year and a half hence.

Five hundred million dollars for reclamation, a fraud on the American farmer, and no work for at least a year and a half.

One hundred million dollars for electrification, which cannot provide any employment at all to speak of and is just for the promotion of a scheme on the part of the administration and is not for relief.

Four hundred and fifty million dollars for housing, which is a year away in the letting of the contracts, a year and a half away in providing employment, and then not very much employment.

Projects for professional and clerical persons, $300,000,000. I do not know what this is. I do not believe anyone else does.

Civilian Conservation Corps, $600,000,000. This is just enough to provide an increase of, perhaps, 125,000 or 130,000 above what they are running now.

Loans or grants for projects of States, Territories, and the District of Columbia or political subdivisions or agencies thereof, $900,000,000.

One hundred and thirty-eight million dollars have been allotted to one city for this purpose, and the number of people who have been given employment under it is 2,254. This is the way it works and this is the way it will work in this bill—a total loss.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Except for the direct relief, there is nothing to the bill. We do not want to make it any worse and we want to get rid of the bad things the Senate has put in and not have it as bad as it is now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I want to call attention to one other thing about the rule, which I think the House ought to understand, before I go any further, and I cannot yield until I do this.

There has been a question raised here—not on the floor, but in private conversation on the part of several Members—

as to the construction of the language of the last part of the rule—as to the conferees being given authority—

To agree with or without amendment, or disagree to any amendment of the Senate to the said joint resolution, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XX.

The effect of that, as I understand it, is to permit the conferees to agree to any Senate amendment on any subject, whether it is legislation or not, put in by a Senate amendment, notwithstanding it may not be authorized by law, and to incorporate it in the conference report, so that they can be voted on at one time instead of having separate votes on the amendments.

I think the rule should be adopted and the bill sent to conference and made just as little objectionable to the needs of the country as possible. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker and Members, when my namesake from Massachusetts rises in his place as spokesman of his party and for the first time in the history of this administration supports a rule of this character, it indicates to my mind that the Grand Old Party has not lost any of the wisdom and cunning of the serpent. [Laughter.] I want to say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that if they did not know before how they ought to vote on this rule, they ought to know now. [Applause.]

They see trouble ahead for the majority in sending these amendments to conference. They see trouble ahead at the other end of the Capitol, it is openly threatened, which may keep it on the calendar for another month.

Mr. Speaker, the country demands action, and the advisers of the President would be wise if they counseled him to accept the Senate amendments and sign the bill and put it into effect at once. We have been here now nearly 3 months without completing a single piece of important legislation, and the national reaction is distinctly not good.

Throughout the country there have sprung up great schemes, enlisting great followings, to bring about prosperity. The people, in their distraction over the economic conditions they have suffered so long, make me think of a man perishing of thirst in a desert, and he sees all about him illusions of water—springs and rivers and lakes—and he rushes to plunge in and slake his burning thirst. To my mind it indicates that the morale of the people is sagging under the strain, and that if a distinct turn for the better does not come soon—and certainly if it does not come within the next 12 months—we may witness the most radical political upheaval, economic in its nature, this country has ever witnessed.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, objects to this monetary legislation and says that it is extraneous to the bill. I want to say that it is not any more extraneous to this bill than the first inflation amendment was to the farm bill. This Congress is so hampered by organization methods and powers and by gag rules, that it is only by extraneous methods we can get anything through that the people want. [Applause.]

Now, I am not for the Thomas amendment primarily for the benefit of mining, to get more mining—I am for it to get more money. We have been trying everything on God's earth to bring us out of the depression except money, and the depression is still with us. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend this very excellent speech of mine in the RECORD. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Colorado is granted. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Thomas amendment to the Public Works bill is the simplest and most definite and most conservative piece of monetary legislation which has been proposed in Congress during this administration. Before pointing out to you just what this amendment does, I want to call your attention for a moment to the law as it now is, as found in the Silver Purchase Act, approved June 19, 1934, the last day of the last Congress.

That act authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver, at home and abroad, in the markets of the world, at such times and upon such terms as he might deem in the national interest, with a limitation that no purchase of silver situated in the United States on May 1, 1934, should be bought at a price in excess of 50 cents an ounce. The Secretary of the Treasury was further authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against all such silver bullion in a face amount not less than the cost of all silver purchased, and it was further directed that such certificates should be placed in "actual" circulation. These silver certificates were made legal tender for all purposes, public and private, and were redeemable in standard silver dollars.

Under the Thomas amendment to the pending Public Works bill the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against all silver bullion now held or hereafter acquired at its monetary value and to place such silver certificates in immediate circulation, and, what is even more important, to keep them in circulation by reissuing them when they return to the Treasury, as has been done for the past 55 years in the case of the greenbacks of the Civil War. That is all there is to it. The other two provisions of the amendment are discretionary: The amendment that the Secretary may, in his discretion, exchange gold for silver, which he is already doing, and the amendment that he may, in his discretion, accept silver in settlement of foreign debts. He already has these powers to a limited extent in existing laws.

It may be, as claimed, that the Secretary of the Treasury has exercised very little of the discretionary power vested in him by the enabling silver legislation passed in the Seventy-third Congress, and that he has not carried out the directions of the Silver Purchase Act. Whatever the fact may be, the Silver Purchase Act has done one great thing, it has exploded the fallacy that there are available such vast stores of cheap silver that its remonetization would submerge and wash away our monetary system. This fallacy was disproved once for all by the fact that under the nationalization-of-silver provisions of the Silver Purchase Act, being section 7 of that act, the Treasury, after a campaign of 90 days in the fall of 1934, was able to capture only 112,000,000 ounces of hoarded silver in the United States, a mere trifle compared with the total of our monetary stocks, not equaling 2 percent of the total volume of five and one-half billions of money in existence in the country, equaling little more than 1 percent of the total stock of gold in the Treasury.

Ever since I can remember the great obstacle to the recognition of silver as money was the supposedly great quantity of cheap silver available for such purposes. That argument is gone forever.

In addition to the 112,000,000 ounces recaptured under the nationalization provision, it is reported that the Treasury has acquired some 200,000,000 ounces by purchase abroad. It is estimated that the Treasury, on the whole, has acquired about 400,000,000 ounces of silver at not to exceed 50 cents an ounce. If certificates have been issued against this silver at its face value, it would amount to $200,000,000. If certificates could be issued against this silver at a monetary value of $1.29 an ounce, instead of 50 cents, the price paid for it, it is estimated that it would expand the circulating medium of the country between three and four hundred million dollars, and the people need it.

Mr. Speaker, attention has been called to the fact that a limit of 50 cents an ounce was placed on the purchase price of hoarded silver. I want to call your attention to the fact that in New York and London on yesterday silver was 60 cents an ounce, an increase of 20 percent over the Government price. What would it be if we did for it what we have done for gold, which went arbitrarily, by executive fiat, from $20.67 per ounce to $35 per ounce? I have asked the question before, and I ask it again, what would be the position and value of silver in the money stocks of the world today had as much been done to preserve its historic status and value as has been done to kill it?

The Thomas amendment to the public-works bill does not require the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase an ounce of silver. It does not require him to pay any given price for it. It merely requires him to issue silver certificates against the bullion now in the Treasury or hereafter acquired. He can acquire no such amount as to result in a dangerous expansion of the currency. This was shown by the action of China placing a 20-percent export tax on her silver shortly after the Silver Purchase Act went into effect. India and China, the great silver money countries of the world, want to keep their silver and keep it cheap, so they can undersell the dear dollars of other countries. If we want to do business with them, we must bring our dollars down and bring their dollars up. We are in a position now to control the monetaray policy of the world, and it is not only to our interest to control it, but our very economic salvation depends upon it. Our dear money and higher standards of living, resulting in high costs of production, are losing us the markets of the world. It is high time we counteracted this trend. The real objection to this silver legislation should be that it is so limited that its results will be almost imperceptible. We would scarcely know in a year that it was in operation. I feel just as confident of this now as I felt a year ago that no great stores of silver were in hoarding in this country or were available in the world for purchase by this country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the money question will be an issue in the next campaign. I believe that the people are fed up on bonds. I believe that if the proposition before us could be submitted to a vote of the people it would be overwhelmingly approved. I believe it would carry ever farm State in the Union. A vote against this amendment is a vote against money and a vote for bonds, interest, and taxes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, with all the earnestness I can command, I call the attention of the House to the position that we are about to be jockeyed into and into which we will be jockeyed if this rule is adopted. The rule provides—

> And that the managers on the part of the House are hereby given specific authority to agree, with or without amendment, or disagree to any amendment of the Senate to the said joint resolution, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XX.

Adopt this rule and here is what you do: You say to the conferees, Go out and represent us; we delegate to you the whole authority of the House of Representatives; go out and agree to any amendment that you want to, and reject any amendment that you want to, and report back with any amendments you may desire. Then the only question that will come to us, and the only thing that we can vote on is to vote up or down the conference report. By the adoption of this rule we are depriving ourselves of the right to pass on these amendments. Some gentlemen may do that, if they so desire, but I am not going to consent to any such procedure. I am not going to delegate my authority and my individual responsibility as a Member of this House. [Applause.] We ought to have the right under the rules of this House to say what amendments we want to adopt, in what amendments we want to concur, and the amendments we want to reject, but you cannot do this if this rule is adopted. When the vote on the previous question comes, we should vote the previous question down by voting "no", so that we may be able to amend the rule and thus be in a position to consider the amendments upon their merits. If the amendments are not proper, we may disagree with the Senate. If they are meritorious, then we should concur in them; but if this rule is adopted or if the previous question is ordered so that we cannot amend the rule, we place ourselves absolutely in the hands of the conferees and must adopt their report when it comes back, regardless of what may happen to the amendments which would give us relief for our schools and which would provide for the building of roads. It is inconceivable that any Member may willingly surrender his constitutional rights as a representative of the people who sent him here, and, in effect, say to them, I am willing for the conferees to determine these questions and I shall gladly follow them. If you vote for the previous question and thus preclude your right to amend the rule and then adopt the rule as now offered, you surrender your prerogative and right to determine what the terms of this legislation may be and will later face the question of the adoption of a conference report containing the terms of this vital legislation which you had no part in framing or adopting.

The adoption of this rule means delay in the Senate on the conference report. That body will exercise its rights and assert its judgment regardless of the conference report, but when we adopt this rule on the previous question, we foreclose all our rights as individual Representatives.

I want to be in harmony with our leadership, but I cannot and will not surrender my rights as a Representative of a free people for the sake of harmony. [Applause.] I appeal to you to exercise your own judgment in matters affecting our Nation and stop this further delegation of power and surrender of our rights. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, about 8 weeks ago we had before us for consideration House Joint Resolution 117, which is commonly known as the public-works appropriation bill and contemplates the appropriation by Congress of approximately $5,000,000,000 for direct relief to the distressed people of the United States and for Public Works projects calculated to stimulate private industry by vast expenditures of public money. This bill, like almost all other new-deal bills, was brought in under a gag rule limiting debate on this vast appropriation to a very few hours. The argument was made at that time that the misery, poverty, and starvation of millions of people in this country demanded immediate action on our part. It was argued that the bill should be passed without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" so that the President's great relief program could go forward unhampered, and that he be given absolute control of the expenditure of the vast sum of money to be appropriated by the resolution. The House Members at that time listened to the Chairman and prominent members of the Rules Committee and adopted the rule. We then listened to a few hours of debate on the part of the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the members of that committee, and, at the conclusion of debate, without having had power to amend the bill at all, we passed it as it was submitted by the Appropriations Committee and transmitted it to the Senate for action by that body.

Since then we have stood by helplessly while the Senate of the United States debated that bill for 8 weeks, sending it back to the Finance Committee of the Senate on one occasion and having it reported by that committee for the second time. During the debate in the Senate the argument was made time and time again that the suffering people of the United States were demanding immediate action on the bill by the Senate. Every argument was made by administration leaders in the Senate in favor of prompt action. The Senate, which is the other great deliberative body of Congress, thoroughly analyzed the bill, exercised its constitutional function of amendment and, on Saturday last, March 23, finally passed it, having added 31 amendments to the bill as it originally passed the House.

It was presented to this body yesterday in the hope that we would give unanimous consent that it be sent to the conference committee selected from the House and Senate. In my opinion, the Senators known as the administration leaders intend that in the conference many of the amendments perfected in the Senate shall be stricken out. I think it is also the intention of the administration leaders in the House that the conference committee will strike many of the amendments added by the Senate. After the conference committee finishes with its work, the conference report will be submitted to the House and to the Senate and will be voted

either up or down; but in all probability the House and the Senate will be precluded from taking any further vote on the bill or any of the amendments, and they will be limited exclusively to a vote on the conference report.

It is my humble opinion that the Senate amendments are mostly beneficial to the people of the United States. The President's power has to some extent been limited and the vast sum provided for is allocated to several types of public-works projects. Certainly the President should not object to some guidance from Congress in the expenditure of this vast sum of money. Certainly he cannot ask the Congress to forego its rights entirely in directing to some extent at least how this money should be spent. I am opposed to the rule now pending before us, because I am fearful that if it is passed and this bill goes to conference many weeks will pass before the bill finally becomes a law, and, while Congress debates, the people in distress will suffer. I have considered the Senate amendments and I find none that seriously impair the bill.

It is my opinion that immediate action is imperative. It is imperative to save the C. C. C. projects which will expire on April 1 unless money is appropriated to carry them on. Schools throughout the United States are closing for lack of funds; one of the Senate amendments provides $40,000,000 for the relief of schools. These relief measures are vital to the happiness and welfare of a stricken people, and the importance of prompt action is far greater than the supposed injurious effect of any amendment that is in the bill. We have listened this morning to the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee who in a general way referred to some of the Senate amendments, but certainly did not enlighten us at all as to how these amendments, or any of them, would be injurious to the administration of the bill or to the people of the United States. He simply told us that he had been advised by administrative officials and employees that the bill was unworkable.

The people choose the Members of the Senate and the House to enact legislation for them, not the heads of the administrative departments in Washington, and for my part, I would rather depend on the deliberate action of the Senate in this matter than on the criticism of the department and bureau heads. In my opinion, we are conferring a favor on the President of the United States if we concur in the Senate amendments and send this bill to the White House for his immediate action. We were advised when the bill first came to this branch of the Congress that the President was demanding immediate action. We responded to his demand, and in my opinion we should now continue to respond to his demand in concurring in the Senate amendments immediately, and sending the bill to the White House for his signature. If speed was imperative 8 weeks ago then certainly the demand for speed has not lessened in 8 weeks.

We see today in the debate the prominent leaders on the Republican side joining the distinguished Chairman of the Rules Committee and the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee in asking support for this rule. When I see the distinguished leaders on the Republican side joining with the Democrats I immediately become skeptical. They tell you that they are opposed to the bill in any form, that they are opposed to the amendments. I believe that they are telling you the truth, and in my opinion nothing would suit the Republican side of this House more than to see the passage of this relief bill held up for another month. The people are outraged at the delay already occasioned in the passage of this bill, and if I am any judge of the demand of our constituents at this time it is that we pass this bill without further delay and I urge my colleagues on the Democratic side at least to give them immediate action by defeating the rule and concurring in the Senate amendment en bloc.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are going through a great deal of shadow boxing this morning and making a great hullabaloo about nothing, because when the Senate and this House voted down the prevailing wage scale amendment the American workers lost their last ditch fight in the Congress of the United States. Whether or not you adopt these Senate amendments, whether you send the joint resolution to conference or do not send it to conference, is immaterial, because none of these amendments mean a thing to the wage earners of this Nation. We have thrown $4,000,000,000 into the labor market at an average scale of $28 for unskilled labor to about $55 a month for skilled labor. Mr. Speaker, this bill sounds the death knell of the American standard of living of American labor. We have reduced American labor to the economic status of the slaves who built the pyramids of ancient Egypt. None of the Senate amendments remedy this situation, and it is most unfortunate that we cannot do anything here because of our rules. That is why I say we are only shadow boxing here. If this matter comes to a record vote, I am going to vote "present" in order to record my protest against this mockery that is now going on before this House. The spokesmen of the present administration have forced the American workers to surrender their economic gains, acquired after years of struggle on the economic battle front. These spokesmen by this bill now say to American labor, "We know you are starving; and if you want to be fed, you must become regimented on the basis of a charity wage scale." The House failed to protect the workers; the Senate failed to protect them; and here we are now simply wasting time over nothing. Therefore, I shall protest against this condition and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion, as is the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], that the Congress should have approved the prevailing wage scale provision and put it into this joint resolution. I realize, however, that it is futile now to expect that we can incorporate such a provision in the joint resolution. The enactment of the joint resolution with the amendments that have been attached to it by the Senate will greatly aid not only labor but all of the people of the country. We should adopt this resolution without any delay, and I favor a motion to concur in the Senate amendments as soon as possible, and thereby make this money available at the earliest possible date. I believe it is our responsibility here to accept these Senate amendments. Therefore I am opposed to this rule, so that we may have an opportunity to concur in the Senate amendments and pass the joint resolution as it has been sent to us by the Senate.

I am in favor of the silver amendment. I believe that it has a great deal of merit. During the consideration of this joint resolution the House had very little time to debate its provisions. The Senate, however, has taken a good deal of time to deliberate on the various proposals, and in my humble judgment the resolution in its present form is as good as we liberals of this House can hope for, and I sincerely hope that we will vote down the previous question, so that we can amend the rule and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I agree that there has been a considerable amount of shadow boxing about this bill placing the control of $4,800,000,000 in the hands of the President. No one has discussed the fundamental objection to the bill; that is, the destruction of representative government and the abdication of the control of the purse strings by Congress, and turning it over to the President. I am opposed to the bill from beginning to end. I am opposed to it on principle. It amounts to a change in our form of government without the consent of the governed. We deliberately propose by our votes to turn over the control of appropriations, the main power of the Congress, to the President of the United States. It makes no difference what kind of a President he is, good, bad, or indifferent, you set up an autocrat, a superman, at

the head of this Government in defiance of the Constitution and the coordinate and separate powers established by the Constitution.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. No. I am sorry, but I cannot yield.

The Senator from Michigan stated that those who were responsible for this bill should be hanged. Now, that is a little harsh. I do not want to see the authors of this bill hanged. That is a little too harsh treatment, but at least we ought to consider deporting the authors of the bill to Fascist Italy, to Nazi Germany, or to communistic Soviet Russia, where they have autocratic governments. This bill destroys the fundamental principles of our Government without the consent of the governed, and if the sponsors of this surrender of legislative power want an autocratic form of government, let them go elsewhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is of little consequence to me, feeling as I do and being opposed to the general principle of the bill that delegates the powers of Congress to the President, whether this rule is voted up or whether it is voted down. Let us look at the record. Just 2 months ago this bill was brought in under a vicious and drastic rule. You Members on the majority side were told to support the bill like rubber stamps; you were given 48 hours to vote for this bill under a rigid gag rule, and were informed that unless you did millions of Americans would starve to death. What a travesty, what a mockery of representative government in the House of Representatives. Two months have gone by, and in spite of what was told you then by your own leaders, that it was necessary to pass it without amendment or debate, it has not yet been enacted into law. We told you then that the bill would be kicked full of holes in the Senate, and that you would not recognize it when it came back; that you would not recognize your own baby. The bill is back, and it is not recognizable at all. The only thing retained in it is the vicious principle of turning over the control of the purse strings to the President. But in spite of that, you acted as you were ordered, and made a laughing-stock of the House of Representatives and voted yourselves as nothing more nor less than a rubber stamp when you voted to strip yourself of your own legislative functions at the dictation of the White House and under the spur of patronage and the lash of Postmaster General Farley.

Mr. Speaker, I admit I am in a predicament. I am not in favor of inflation; but, on the other hand, I am in favor of the House of Representatives voting down gag rules and considering bills on their merits. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ]

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, if you will look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Saturday and analyze the proceedings of the Senate when they passed this bill, you will then see with what trickery it was done. Three of the five Members of the Senate who have been put on this conference committee are against the passage of this bill. It was a trick. It would be a good thing for us to vote so that the amendments will stick, to fool them at their own trick. That is all they tried to do. They passed the Thomas amendment without a vote, as if to say, "We will pass it, but afterward we will cut its head off." Now let us pass this bill with the amendments as they are. I am against this rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ] has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, very much is being said about inflation. I think if we study the results of the increase in currency in this country we would see that a steady increase of the volume of money put into circulation is absolutely necessary to conduct business and to maintain the price level. The effect of increasing the volume of money in circulation, commonly referred to as "inflation", has been conclusively demonstrated in the past history of this country. Let me refer you to Senate Document No. 210, containing the minutes of a meeting of the Federal Reserve Board on May 18, 1920, and the statement made to the Board by Governor W. P. G. Harding at that time, when he pointed out that as a result of an increase of $1,900,000,000 put into circulation in the period between 1914 and 1920 we had an expansion of $11,000,000,000 in credit and we had an increase in the price of commodities of 25 percent and a decrease in production. If there is anything that this Government is trying to do, it is to increase prices and decrease production. If there is anything that is necessary to the restoration of prosperity in this country, it is a rise in the price level, both in property values and commodity prices. To do this we must meet the money needs of the people by adopting a plan that will supply a flow of new money into the channels of trade to keep pace with the increase of population and the growth of business. The issuance of silver certificates, authorized by the bill we are considering, is a safe and sound plan to meet this necessity by controlled inflation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, this rule is not an extraordinary rule. It is simply intended to follow the usual course where differences arise between the House and the Senate. It is not unusual for the House to delegate authority to a limited number of its Members, representing the committees of the House, to try to iron out differences between the House and the Senate.

The Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has called your attention to the fact that some of the amendments which were put on are not, in his judgment, workable. I am sure that those who are opposing the rule, some of those who spoke first, have not carefully examined the amendments, and they are not now prepared to discuss before the House the different amendments which have been put on by the Senate, in order to meet the objections suggested by the chairman of the committee.

In other words, some of my good friends who are usually so frank and so very candid have not, in fact, discussed the real objections they have to the rule now under consideration. Their objective is based on one amendment they are deeply interested in, and they are prepared to discuss everything in order to get that.

If the conferees should bring back a report that a majority of the House feel is unwise and not in conformity with their wishes, then you have full authority to vote down the conference report. This is not unusual; you have done it within the last few years, I know.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Not now; my time is too short.

I do want to give this information since the gentleman from Texas called attention to it and it seems to have been urged as an argument in opposition to the rule. I refer to amendment 25, found on page 14, section 13, relating to public schools. It has been argued that there is great danger if you do not at once concur in the Senate's action that the schools may be affected adversely. The Senate in writing this amendment did not require a single dollar to be spent for schools. Read it and you will find it is left entirely to the discretion of the President and a definite limitation is placed on the amount that may be spent. As the chairman said, all the conferees are interested in caring for the emergency needs of public schools, and we will probably improve the amendment inserted by the Senate. I only call your attention to this to show that often when an argument is advanced purely for the purpose of registering an objection it goes too far.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Under the Senate amendment to the bill with respect to schools only $40,000,000 could be allocated to schools.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But we are contemplating amending the Senate amendment in such a way as to make $300,000,000 available to schools.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he has any time remaining?

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how the time stands now?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has 12 minutes with the time yielded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RANKIN. And this exhausts the time?

The SPEAKER. This exhausts the time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this rule has been called a "gag" rule of various types, such as a "vicious gag rule", as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has declaimed. I maintain it is not a "gag" rule, and I say this earnestly. It is not an unusual rule, and it does not provide for unusual procedure in this House.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] spoke of the last clause in the rule, which provides that the managers on the part of the House are given specific authority to agree or disagree with any amendment on the part of the Senate—and I emphasize the word "disagree" with any amendment—which violates clause 2 of rule XX. Clause 2 of rule XX provides, in effect, that if an amendment of the Senate to a general appropriation bill—and this House Joint Resolution 117 is not a general appropriation bill—violates clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits legislation on an appropriation bill, and no amendment of the Senate providing for an appropriation upon any bill other than a general appropriation bill shall be agreed to by the House managers unless a separate vote is just taken on said amendment.

This last clause of this rule meets that situation. House Joint Resolution 117 is not a general appropriation bill. In effect, it is not an appropriation bill at all, but a house joint resolution providing for relief measures, to put 3,500,000 men back to work. Those thirty-odd amendments of the Senate, many of which may come within that category, could not be agreed to or disagreed to by the House managers without that specific authority.

There has been some confusion here, but it was partially cleared up by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] when he stated, in effect, that we are in the same position today, and in no different position than we shall be in when the conference report comes back to us. If a sufficient number of Members here do not agree to the conference report, which represents the action on the part of the conferees, our managers, the House can vote down the conference report and then vote on any amendment to which our conferees agreed or disagreed.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would rather complete my statement. Then I shall be glad to yield if I have time.

Ordinarily when a House bill comes back with Senate amendments there are four methods of procedure: One is that the bill can be referred to the committee which originated it, in this instance the Committee on Appropriations. Do those Members who have expressed such tearful sympathy with the possibility of the cessation of the C. C. C. camps, and who use that argument for quick action on this bill, want the bill sent to the Appropriations Committee? Do they want it considered by that committee almost as an original bill and then have it considered in the Committee of the Whole? The usual method, the normal method, the method used 999 times out of 1,000, is to send the bill directly to conference by unanimous consent when it comes back to the House with Senate amendments; that is almost an invariable rule, and that is what this special rule, so called, does. In the face of objection to unanimous consent, such a result could not happen without a special rule. Moreover, a special rule would be necessary that this bill be referred back to the Appropriations Committee. So we are proceeding in the orderly way—the usual way—in this House when we propose this rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. When I get through, if the gentleman please.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is wrong in that statement.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; I am sure I am not wrong about it. This is not a general appropriation bill and has no privileged status in this House. It has no more privileged status than though it were a bill which came from one of the standing legislative committees, a bill which did not involve appropriation or the raising of revenue.

Mr. Speaker, we are faced with the practical situation of how most expeditiously, in accordance with the orderly procedure of this House, to handle this joint resolution for relief.

Some of us who are supporting this rule are most sympathetic with some of these amendments.

Some of us have always welcomed a chance to vote for the proper recognition of silver, and if that matter came up in an orderly way some of us would feel inclined to support such a measure. If the proposal came out of the standing committee which has jurisdiction of legislation relating to silver, some of us would support it. If the measure came in even as an amendment to a general appropriation bill, some of us would feel inclined to support it, but the silver legislation has no place in this measure. House Joint Resolution 117 is a relief measure wholly and entirely. That is why we want to proceed in an orderly way in reference to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, something has been said about the "dignity" of the House of Representatives, and how it has fallen from its high pedestal. Let me say, after due deliberation, that the House of Representatives may well take pride in the fact that it can legislate orderly and expeditiously. [Applause.] This rule is proposed for that very purpose, and I, for one, do not intend to match demagogy against demagogy. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, this great House of Representatives can legislate expeditiously and more without the fear of any one man, whether he came by railroad train or airplane, or without the fear of any one group. We legislate in this House by a majority, and that majority can always express the will of this House. No rule from the Rules Committee can ever deprive the majority of this right.

This House must function, and it must legislate irrespective of any individual or any group, short of a majority. I for one am willing to match the method of procedure in this body as against another body. We do not rush things through to get under the wire before somebody returns to town. [Laughter and applause.] When we are faced with amendments put on a House bill that are not put on with sincerity or with any hope or expectation that they would ever stick in the bill, we, as a parliamentary body, are compelled to face that situation, and keep our feet on the floor and not be swept off our foundation by any one man or by any minority.

We have been told here today that if we pass this rule there will be a filibuster in another body, which will occupy weeks. Why, there has been an unwarranted and a disgraceful filibuster there already for nearly 2 months. We are always able to handle filibusters in this body. We are proud of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is a test of not yielding to another body, of not yielding to one man or to a small group of men in another body. This rule is the real test of maintaining the dignity of our own body. We have not lost that dignity. This rule is a test of maintaining our own dignity and maintaining the right to conduct our parliamentary deliberations in an orderly, respectable, and dignified manner. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 265, nays 108, answered "present" 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—265

Andresen	Ditter	Kennedy, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.
Andrew, Mass.	Dobbins	Kenney	Reilly
Arnold	Dondero	Kimball	Rich
Ashbrook	Dorsey	Kinzer	Richardson
Barden	Doughton	Kloeb	Robertson
Beam	Doxey	Kocialkowski	Rogers, Mass.
Beiter	Drewry	Kramer	Rogers, N. H.
Bell	Driscoll	Lambeth	Romjue
Berlin	Driver	Lanham	Rudd
Biermann	Duffey, Ohio	Larrabee	Russell
Blackney	Duffy, N. Y.	Lea, Calif.	Ryan
Bland	Eaton	Lehlbach	Sadowski
Blanton	Eckert	Lewis, Colo.	Sanders, La.
Bloom	Edmiston	Lewis, Md.	Sandlin
Boehne	Ekwall	Lloyd	Schuetz
Boland	Ellenbogen	Lord	Sears
Boylan	Engel	Lucas	Secrest
Brennan	Evans	Ludlow	Shanley
Brewster	Fenerty	McAndrews	Sisson
Brooks	Fiesinger	McCormack	Smith, Conn.
Brown, Ga.	Fish	McGrath	Smith, Va.
Brown, Mich.	Fitzpatrick	McLaughlin	Snyder
Brunner	Flannagan	McMillan	Spence
Buchanan	Focht	McReynolds	Stack
Buck	Ford, Calif.	Mahon	Starnes
Buckbee	Frey	Mansfield	Steagall
Buckley, N. Y.	Fuller	Mapes	Stubbs
Bulwinkle	Fulmer	Marshall	Sullivan
Burch	Gavagan	Martin, Mass.	Sumners, Tex.
Burnham	Gearhart	Mason	Sutphin
Caldwell	Gifford	Mead	Taber
Carden	Gildea	Merritt, Conn.	Tarver
Carlson	Gillette	Merritt, N. Y.	Taylor, S. C.
Carmichael	Gingery	Michener	Terry
Carter	Goldsborough	Millard	Thom
Cary	Goodwin	Mitchell, Ill.	Thomas
Casey	Gray, Pa.	Montague	Thomason
Castellow	Green	Montet	Thompson
Celler	Gregory	Mott	Thurston
Chandler	Guyer	Nelson	Tinkham
Chapman	Gwynne	O'Brien	Tolan
Christianson	Haines	O'Connell	Tonry
Church	Halleck	O'Connor	Turner
Citron	Hamlin	O'Day	Umstead
Claiborne	Hancock, N. Y.	O'Leary	Vinson, Ga.
Clark, N. C.	Harlan	Oliver	Vinson, Ky.
Cochran	Hart	O'Neal	Wadsworth
Cole, Md.	Harter	Owen	Walter
Cole, N. Y.	Hartley	Palmisano	Warren
Colmer	Hennings	Parks	Weaver
Cooley	Higgins, Conn.	Parsons	Welch
Cooper, Ohio	Higgins, Mass.	Patton	West
Cooper, Tenn.	Hill, Ala.	Pearson	Whelchel
Corning	Hobbs	Perkins	Whittington
Costello	Hoffman	Peterson, Fla.	Wigglesworth
Cox	Holmes	Peterson, Ga.	Wilcox
Cravens	Hope	Pettengill	Williams
Crowe	Huddleston	Pfeifer	Wilson, La.
Culkin	Igoe	Plumley	Wilson, Pa.
Cullen	Imhoff	Polk	Wolcott
Daly	Jacobsen	Powers	Wolfenden
Darden	Jenckes, Ind.	Ramsay	Woodruff
Darrow	Jenkins, Ohio	Ramspeck	Woodrum
Delaney	Johnson, Tex.	Ransley	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Jones	Rayburn	
Dietrich	Kee	Reece	
Dingell	Kelly	Reed, Ill.	

NAYS—108

Amlie	Faddis	Luckey	Robinson, Utah
Ayers	Fernandez	Lundeen	Rogers, Okla.
Bacharach	Fletcher	McClellan	Sanders, Tex.
Binderup	Ford, Miss.	McFarlane	Sauthoff
Boileau	Gasque	McGroarty	Schneider
Buckler, Minn.	Gassaway	McLeod	Scott
Burdick	Gehrmann	Maas	Scrugham
Cannon, Mo.	Gilchrist	Maloney	Short
Carpenter	Gray, Ind.	Martin, Colo.	Sirovich
Cartwright	Greenway	Massingale	Smith, Wash.
Clark, Idaho	Greever	Maverick	South
Coffee	Hancock, N. C.	May	Stefan
Colden	Hildebrandt	Miller	Sweeney
Collins	Hill, Knute	Mitchell, Tenn.	Taylor, Colo.
Connery	Hill, Samuel B.	Monaghan	Taylor, Tenn.
Crawford	Hoeppel	Moran	Tobey
Cross, Tex.	Hook	Moritz	Turpin
Crosser, Ohio	Houston	Murdock	Utterback
Cummings	Hull	Nichols	Wallgren
Deen	Johnson, Okla.	O'Malley	Wearin
Dies	Keller	Patman	Werner
Dirksen	Kerr	Patterson	White
Disney	Kniffin	Pierce	Withrow
Dockweiler	Knutson	Pittenger	Wolverton
Duncan	Lambertson	Randolph	Wood
Eagle	Lee, Okla.	Rankin	Young
Eicher	Lemke	Richards	Zioncheck

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—57

Adair	Dunn, Miss.	Kleberg	Sabath
Allen	Dunn, Pa.	Kopplemann	Schaefer
Andrews, N. Y.	Englebright	Kvale	Schulte
Arends	Farley	Lamneck	Seger
Bacon	Ferguson	Lesinski	Shannon
Bankhead	Gambrill	McGehee	Smith, W. Va.
Bolton	Granfield	McKeough	Snell
Cannon, Wis.	Greenwood	McLean	Somers, N. Y.
Cavicchia	Griswold	McSwain	Stewart
Crosby	Healey	Meeks	Treadway
Crowther	Hess	Norton	Truax
Dear	Hollister	Peyser	Underwood
DeRouen	Johnson, W. Va.	Quinn	
Dickstein	Kahn	Rabaut	
Doutrich	Kennedy, Md.	Robsion, Ky.	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hess (for) with Mr. Ferguson (against).
Mr. Dickstein (for) with Mr. Truax (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. McLean.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Griswold with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Granfield with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Bacon.
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Sabath with Mrs. Kahn.
Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Kvale.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Dear.
Mr. Adair with Mr. Dunn of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Crosby with Mr. Farley.
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. McGehee.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Quinn.
Mr. McKeough with Mr. Meeks.
Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.
Mr. Peyser with Mr. Rabaut.

Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts, and Mr. FOCHT changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLENBOGEN). The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-four Members have risen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the count.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state that according to the roll call there were 371 Members present. It is very evident that the number who arose was not one-fifth of the number present as shown by the roll call.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I counted 70 myself.

The SPEAKER. It would take more than 70 to order the yeas and nays.

So the yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Do I understand the teller vote is taken on the passage of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 186, noes 78.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order we were entitled to a roll-call vote, because this vote shows there are not five times as many Members in the House as stood up a while ago and asked for a roll-call vote.

The SPEAKER. By the gentleman's own count of 70, he was not entitled to a roll-call vote, because it requires 75, according to the roll call which has just been completed.

Mr. RANKIN. I beg the Chair's pardon; what was the report?

The SPEAKER. This vote was on an entirely different question, and the Chair has no doubt but what many Members have gone to their offices since the roll call was completed.

Mr. RANKIN. No; Mr. Speaker, many Members have come in since then.

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is there any way by which we can get a roll-call vote at this time?

The SPEAKER. The House has refused a roll-call vote on the passage of the resolution.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to have a roll-call vote on the basis of the number of Members present, as indicated by the teller vote, if one-fifth of the number shown by the teller vote would now ask for a roll-call vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that quite a number of minutes—15 or 20, or perhaps one-half an hour—has elapsed since the House refused the roll call, and that roll call was requested immediately after a roll call of the House which disclosed 371 Members present. It therefore took 75 Members to order a roll call, and according to the count there were not 75 Members standing.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi did not vote in the majority and cannot make that motion.

Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to and to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the question be divided.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, is this a vote on tabling the motion to reconsider or on the motion to reconsider itself?

The SPEAKER. It is on tabling the motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 263, nays 106, answered "present" 1, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—263

Andresen	Carlson	Dear	Fulmer
Andrew, Mass.	Carmichael	Delaney	Gavagan
Arnold	Carter	Dempsey	Gearhart
Ashbrook	Cary	Dietrich	Gifford
Barden	Castellow	Dingell	Gildea
Beam	Celler	Ditter	Gillette
Beiter	Chandler	Dobbins	Gingery
Bell	Chapman	Dondero	Goldsborough
Berlin	Christianson	Dorsey	Goodwin
Biermann	Church	Doughton	Gray, Pa.
Blackney	Citron	Doxey	Green
Bland	Claiborne	Drewry	Gregory
Blanton	Clark, N. C.	Driscoll	Guyer
Bloom	Cochran	Driver	Gwynne
Boehne	Colden	Duffey, Ohio	Haines
Boland	Cole, Md.	Duffy, N. Y.	Halleck
Boylan	Cole, N. Y.	Eaton	Hamlin
Brennan	Colmer	Eckert	Hancock, N. Y.
Brewster	Cooley	Edmiston	Harlan
Brooks	Cooper, Ohio	Ekwall	Hart
Brown, Ga.	Cooper, Tenn.	Ellenbogen	Harter
Brown, Mich.	Corning	Engel	Hartley
Brunner	Costello	Evans	Hennings
Buchanan	Cox	Fenerty	Higgins, Conn.
Buck	Cravens	Fiesinger	Higgins, Mass.
Buckbee	Crawford	Fish	Hill, Ala.
Buckley, N. Y.	Crowe	Fitzpatrick	Hobbs
Bulwinkle	Culkin	Flannagan	Hoffman
Burch	Cullen	Focht	Holmes
Burnham	Daly	Ford, Calif.	Hope
Caldwell	Darden	Frey	Huddleston
Carden	Darrow	Fuller	Igoe
Imhoff	Martin, Mass.	Rayburn	Tarver
Jenckes, Ind.	Mason	Reece	Taylor, S. C.
Jenkins, Ohio	Mead	Reed, Ill.	Terry
Johnson, Tex.	Merritt, Conn.	Reed, N. Y.	Thom
Jones	Merritt, N. Y.	Reilly	Thomas
Kee	Michener	Rich	Thomason
Kelly	Millard	Richardson	Thompson
Kennedy, N. Y.	Mitchell, Ill.	Robertson	Tinkham
Kenney	Montague	Rogers, Mass.	Tolan
Kimball	Montet	Rogers, N. H.	Tonry
Kinzer	Mott	Romjue	Treadway
Kloeb	Nelson	Rudd	Turner
Knutson	O'Brien	Russell	Umstead
Kocialkowski	O'Connell	Ryan	Vinson, Ga.
Kopplemann	O'Connor	Sanders, La.	Vinson, Ky.
Kramer	O'Day	Sandlin	Wadsworth
Lanham	O'Leary	Schuetz	Walter
Larrabee	Oliver	Schulte	Warren
Lehlbach	O'Neal	Sears	Weaver
Lewis, Colo.	Owen	Secrest	Welch
Lloyd	Palmisano	Shanley	West
Lord	Parks	Shannon	Whelchel
Lucas	Parsons	Sisson	Whittington
Ludlow	Patton	Smith, Conn.	Wigglesworth
McAndrews	Pearson	Smith, Va.	Wilcox
McCormack	Peterson, Fla.	Snyder	Williams
McGrath	Peterson, Ga.	Spence	Wilson, La.
McLaughlin	Pfeifer	Starnes	Wilson, Pa.
McMillan	Plumley	Steagall	Wolcott
McReynolds	Polk	Stubbs	Wolfenden
Mahon	Powers	Sullivan	Woodruff
Mansfield	Ramsay	Sumners, Tex.	Woodrum
Mapes	Ramspeck	Sutphin	Zimmerman
Marshall	Ransley	Taber	

NAYS—106

Amlie	Fletcher	McFarlane	Sanders, Tex.
Ayers	Ford, Miss.	McGroarty	Sauthoff
Bacharach	Gasque	McLeod	Schneider
Binderup	Gassaway	Maas	Scott
Boileau	Gehrmann	Maloney	Scrugham
Buckler, Minn.	Gilchrist	Martin, Colo.	Short
Burdick	Gray, Ind.	Massingale	Sirovich
Cannon, Mo.	Greenway	Maverick	Smith, Wash.
Carpenter	Hancock, N. C.	May	South
Cartwright	Hildebrandt	Miller	Stefan
Clark, Idaho	Hill, Knute	Mitchell, Tenn.	Sweeney
Coffee	Hill, Samuel B.	Monaghan	Taylor, Colo.
Collins	Hoeppel	Moran	Taylor, Tenn.
Connery	Hook	Moritz	Tobey
Cross, Tex.	Houston	Murdock	Turpin
Crosser, Ohio	Hull	Nichols	Utterback
Cummings	Jacobsen	O'Malley	Wallgren
Deen	Johnson, Okla.	Patman	Wearin
Dies	Keller	Patterson	Werner
Dirksen	Kerr	Perkins	White
Disney	Kniffin	Pierce	Withrow
Dockweiler	Lambertson	Pittenger	Wolverton
Duncan	Lee, Okla.	Randolph	Wood
Eagle	Lemke	Rankin	Young
Eicher	Luckey	Richards	Zioncheck
Faddis	Lundeen	Robinson, Utah	
Fernandez	McClellan	Rogers, Okla.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—61

Adair	Dunn, Pa.	Kvale	Robsion, Ky.
Allen	Englebright	Lambeth	Sabath
Andrews, N. Y.	Farley	Lamneck	Sadowski
Arends	Ferguson	Lea, Calif.	Schaefer
Bacon	Gambrill	Lesinski	Seger
Bankhead	Granfield	Lewis, Md.	Smith, W. Va.
Bolton	Greenwood	McGehee	Snell
Cannon, Wis.	Greever	McKeough	Somers, N. Y.
Casey	Griswold	McLean	Stack
Cavicchia	Healey	McSwain	Stewart
Crosby	Hess	Meeks	Thurston
Crowther	Hollister	Norton	Truax
DeRouen	Johnson, W. Va.	Pettengill	Underwood
Dickstein	Kahn	Peyser	
Doutrich	Kennedy, Md.	Quinn	
Dunn, Miss.	Kleberg	Rabaut	

So the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hess (for) with Mr. Ferguson (against).
Mr. Dickstein (for) with Mr. Truax (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. McLean.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Griswold with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Granfield with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Bacon.
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Sabath with Mrs. Kahn.

Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Engelbright.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Kvale.
Mr. Lambeth with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Thurston.
Mr. Adair with Mr. Dunn of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Crosby with Mr. Farley.
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. McGehee.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Quinn.
Mr. McKeough with Mr. Meeks.
Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.
Mr. Peyser with Mr. Rabaut.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Greever.
Mr. Lewis of Maryland with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Stack with Mr. Pettengill.

Mr. AMLIE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ANDRESEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GRANFIELD, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HEALEY, are absent today on account of official business. If present, they would vote "yea" on this roll call.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, may the RECORD show that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SHANNON, is absent on account of serious illness, and I ask that he may be excused from attending sessions of the House for an indefinite period.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Mrs. NORTON, is absent from the House on account of illness. If present, she would vote "yea" on this motion and "yea" on the passage of the resolution.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Chair appointed as conferees on the part of the House Messrs. BUCHANAN, TAYLOR of Colorado, ARNOLD, OLIVER, TABER, and BACON.

THE CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION AT SAN DIEGO

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the California-Pacific International Exposition, San Diego, Calif., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, reported by me on order of the Ways and Means Committee on yesterday.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this measure to the House? As I understand it, the resolution is the customary resolution insofar as expositions are concerned.

Mr. BUCK. The resolution is in the ordinary form, Mr. Speaker, which has been adopted by Congresses in the past, permitting exporters at this exposition to import articles under bond and without the payment of tariff duties at the time they are imported; but in the event that sales of any of the exhibits are made, the tariff duties must be paid in full to the United States Government.

The measure has a unanimous report from the Ways and Means Committee and it also has the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentlemen on the Republican side why it is that yesterday, for instance, when something which was vital to labor came up under unanimous-consent request, they felt it their imperative duty to object, but today, with respect to another matter, there seems to be no objection. Why do they not say to these gentlemen today to let it go over until the Consent Calendar is called?

I am in favor of the gentleman's proposition, but I merely want to call this to the attention of the House. What is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman want to object?

Mr. CONNERY. No; by no means. I would not object to any Member's getting consideration for something that is of benefit to his city or State, particularly if it is for labor, like I tried to do yesterday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not know anything about the gentleman's request. Who was it that objected to the gentleman's request yesterday?

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the Republican leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Is the gentleman trying to lead the labor of the country bodily into the Democratic Party?

Mr. CONNERY. No; not at all.

Mr. CULKIN. I do not think this position of the gentleman is very well taken.

Mr. CONNERY. I am just calling attention to something which happened on the floor of this House yesterday with respect to two matters which the Department of Labor and the Committee on Labor wanted considered.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk proceeded to read the joint resolution, which is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 174

Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the international exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., beginning in May 1935, by the California-Pacific International Exposition Co., or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign buildings or exhibits at the said exposition, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said exposition, to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles, which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles, which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond, and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the California-Pacific International Exposition Co. shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the California-Pacific International Exposition Co. to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930.

Mr. BUCK (interrupting the reading of the joint resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that the resolution in its entirety be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on the Consent Calendar there are two bills, one authorizing the President to ask the foreign countries to participate in these expositions——

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the gentleman to say that this joint resolution has nothing to do with the

bills on the Consent Calendar? This refers to the San Diego Exposition, for which we have already appropriated $350,000 for a Government exhibit. The exposition opens on May 29, which is the reason for expediting this measure and calling it up out of order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There are two bills on the Consent Calendar having to do with expositions, and I wondered how many exhibitions they are going to hold in California.

Mr. BUCK. Those bills refer to 1938, a long way ahead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have asked for this time for the purpose of formally bringing before the House the petitions that were presented this morning on the east steps of the Capitol by Michael F. Shannon, grand exalted ruler of the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks.

This formal presentation ceremony took place at 11 o'clock this morning, and they were received by the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House in behalf of their respective bodies.

These petitions contain something like a million names of representative citizens throughout the country. They are designed to bring to the attention of the Congress a program intended to combat as far as possible the sinister influences at work throughout the country that are seeking by force and violence or other unlawful means the overthrow of the Government.

I do this because it is necessary, as I understand it, to bring the matter in some way formally before the House. The petitions, I assume, will be referred by the Speaker to the proper committee. I do not know what committee has jurisdiction, but I presume it is the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. The purposes set forth in these petitions are as follows:

First. Empower the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to investigate all subversive activities of individuals and organizations, alien or otherwise, seeking or planning the overthrow of our Government by force or violence or other unlawful means and to employ the usual investigational methods therefor. The Department of Justice should also be charged with the discretionary authority of publication of the truth about organizations and individuals engaged in subversive activities and supplied with sufficient funds and personnel to carry on the foregoing.

Second. Declare organizations which advocate the overthrow by force and violence of our Government to be illegal organizations and prohibit their existence in any territory under the jurisdiction of the United States.

Third. Declare it a felony for an individual to publicly or secretly advocate, promote, or encourage the overthrow or change of our form of government by force and violence, or to knowingly belong to any society, association, group, or organization which has for its object or one of its objects the advocacy or furtherance of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence or any unlawful means.

Fourth. Effectively close the United States mails to newspapers or other publications advocating, encouraging, or affiliated with any organization advocating or encouraging the overthrow of Government by force and violence.

Fifth. Prohibit the interstate transportation of newspapers or other publications advocating, encouraging, or affiliated with any organization advocating or encouraging the overthrow of Government by force and violence.

Sixth. Make clear the laws for the deportation of all aliens advocating the overthrow or change of our system of government by force and violence and make certain the impounding without bail of any such aliens pending deportation.

Seventh. Prohibit the entry into the United States of any individual who is known to advocate the overthrow or change of government by force or violence and clarify the law so that there can be no conflict of authority between departments of our Government in the execution of this law or regulations made under it.

Eighth. Provide for the revocation of the naturalization of any naturalized citizen who advocates the overthrow of our Government by force or violence.

This is a most worthy undertaking by this great fraternal order, and I think the House should know of the formal presentation and reception of these petitions, which are designed to impress upon the country and the Congress these evil influences at work in this country and to combat them as much as possible. [Applause.]

THE BONUS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, provided it is not inserted in the RECORD by the Senate, to insert in the RECORD an address delivered over the radio by Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is printed in the RECORD by request of Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST, of Arizona, p. 4426.)

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of business on the Speaker's table tomorrow morning I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table tomorrow he be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. It has been the custom of the House not to allow long speeches where we have bills before us.

Mr. HARLAN. Does the gentleman expect to proceed with the naval appropriation bill tomorrow?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think so.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman thinks that will interfere with his program, I withdraw the request.

FRIENDLY NATIONS

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the Minister of the Irish Free State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following international radio address by the Honorable Michael MacWhite, Minister of the Irish Free State, delivered on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1935:

In the document which St. Patrick called his "confession", he tells of a vision he had in the night in which he saw a man coming, as it were, from Ireland with countless letters. And this man, he adds, "gave me one of them, and I read the beginning of the letter, which was entitled 'The Voice of the Irish', and while I was reading aloud the beginning of the letter, I thought that at that very moment I heard the voice of them who lived beside the Wood of Foclut, which is nigh unto the western sea."

Today the voice of the Irish is heard in all the lands that are watered by the seven seas, and through the courtesy of the American Irish Historical Society, which is vitally interested in everything affecting the two countries, some voices from this great Republic of the west are carrying to Ireland messages of esteem, friendship, and admiration. It was because St. Patrick devoted himself so valiantly and so whole-heartedly to the summons which came to him in the Voice of the Irish that today his feast has become a day of celebration, not for the Irish alone but for practically the people of all the countries in the world.

As the official representative of the Irish Government in the United States, it is a source of perpetual wonder and gratification to me to note the manner in which this day is observed by the American people. In every street in every one of the great cities, and in every town and village, the shop windows display some emblem or some objects that are reminiscent of Ireland.

There is no newspaper in any quarter of the country this week without reference to St. Patrick, and all these notices and references are of such a kind as to impress on one the belief that the generous people of America, whatever be their politics or religion, give to St. Patrick the same measure of devotion and veneration that they would if the voice that called him 1,500 years ago had come from nigh unto this western sea. Today in hundreds of halls and banquet rooms people gather to honor St. Patrick and to listen to orators, who tell them of his glories and achievements and of the glories and achievements of the Irish

race. The flag of Ireland flies side by side with the Stars and Stripes, and speakers and listeners alike rejoice in the conviction that in honoring St. Patrick they are at the same time expressing their devotion to the principles and purposes of which the United States has become the embodiment.

It would be no exaggeration on my part to say that the homage paid to our patron saint in this country would be a revelation to our people at home. The green favors displayed in New York alone, if joined together, would easily reach to Ireland and back again. It cannot be denied that St. Patrick is America's best venerated saint, and who can venerate St. Patrick without at the same time loving the land he made his own?

In America today the children of St. Patrick play a prominent part in public life. In church and state, in commerce and industry, in science and literature, Irish names are becoming increasingly numerous toward the top. Descendants of Irish immigrants are numerically greater in the Congress of the United States today than at any time in American history. The loyalty of American citizens of Irish origin has never been questioned. Many years ago John Randolph, of Roanoke, a great American patriot, said ," I have seen a white crow and heard of black swans, but an Irish opponent of American liberty I never either saw or heard of."

The bonds which unite the people of Ireland and the people of the United States are not of yesterday. These bonds were knit during the heroic days when America was engaged in the Revolution, and of which this great Republic rose to the full status of Nationhood. One of the first messages of the Continental Congress in 1775 was addressed to the Irish people thanking them for their friendliness to the rights of mankind and acknowledging the fact that the Irish nation had produced patriots who had already "distinguished themselves in the cause of humanity and of America."

The spirit of complete understanding of American aims, of friendship and of sympathy which led thousands of Irishmen to take their places beside the struggling patriots of the Colonies, and to make a willing sacrifice of their lives that American democracy might be born, has remained unimpaired by the passing of years. Ireland and America are now one in spirit as they were then. The fervor of patriotism is no stronger in one than in the other and both are animated by the same high resolve that government of the people in any country of the world shall be by the people of that country and that democracy shall not perish from the earth.

There is a union of minds and souls between the people of the two countries that can never be broken by suspicion, rivalry, or the lust for conquest. This union is closer than any that could be established by the tenuous threads of diplomacy and too strong to be rent by the designs of international intrigue. The celebration of St. Patrick's Day, year by year, tends to bring the two countries into closer and more intimate relations and to solidify the friendship that already exists into something stronger and more enduring. No one who has the opportunity to listen to the men who are called upon to speak at the celebrations in honor of St. Patrick can escape the conviction that the American mind has a clear grasp of the place which Ireland now holds and will increasingly hold in the affairs of the world. Peace for Europe and, perhaps, for the entire world will be assured when the feeling of Ireland for America will spread eastward to other countries, and when it will not be necessary to think of international relations in terms of bombing planes, poison gases, bombproof shelters, fortresses, and vessels of war. The voice of Ireland may in the future call again to Europe and under Divine Providence it may awake in it the spirit of St. Patrick and the day may come when the entire world will be united in a common purpose as unselfish and noble as that which makes of St. Patrick's Day a world-wide festival.

It is in this spirit I wish to convey to the people of Ireland today the fraternal greetings of their myriad of friends in the United States and to the people of America the assurance of our all-abiding friendship and good will.

DEPORTATION OF JOHN STRACHEY

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of a letter which I have written.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me, I am herewith presenting a copy of a letter that I have written to the Commissioner of Immigration in protest against the deportation proceedings that have been instituted against John Strachey, a British subject:

MARCH 25, 1935.

Col. DANIEL W. MACCORMACK,
Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization,
Department of Labor.

DEAR COLONEL MACCORMACK: This letter is written for the purpose of protesting against the action of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization in ordering the arrest and deportation of Mr. John Strachey, Marxian author, who is now lecturing in the United States.

I realize that it may not be politic, but I feel that it is my duty to make such a protest. There are greater issues involved in this case than the mere deportation of an English subject.

In the first place, I want to state candidly that in my opinion this action on the part of the Commissioner of Immigration has been brought about through the influence of powerful and sinister forces at work in this country today.

Newspapers which have come to my desk indicate that reactionary local business interests have sought to prevent Mr. Strachey from speaking in various parts of the country. The San Francisco Chronicle for February 4, 1935, contains an editorial entitled "Intolerance usually defeats its own end." It goes on to say:

"The Los Angeles custom has been for one group to determine what speakers other groups should be permitted to hear. The method is to use pressure on owners of halls to refuse to rent them to organizations wishing to listen to addresses to which the suppression groups object. Now, for the first time the same thing has happened in San Francisco."

The editorial goes on to state that a branch of the League of Women Voters of San Francisco had invited Mr. John Strachey to give a lecture to this group. The editorial goes on to say:

"Now, we submit that it is the business of these excellent and responsible women, and nobody else, whom they wish to hear. Many of them are intelligent conservatives—but not stupid ones like those who would forbid them to hear an explanation of the radical movement from its most brilliant living exponent."

Apparently, however, these reactionary business interests have not succeeded as well as they had wished by these bludgeoning tactics and are now seeking to use the Office of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

I believe that I am using this expression advisedly. Not long ago it came to my attention that a super-reactionary organization of big business men had raised a campaign fund of almost a million dollars for the purpose of carrying out their program.

I have learned from personal observation that when organizations capable of raising money in such sums decide to strike, they do not strike from the bottom but directly from the top.

A local newspaper carried a news item last week in which the Secretary of Labor was quoted to the effect that she would have nothing to do with this matter.

I do not know what the regular order of business may be within the Department of Labor, but I do know that the decision to arrest Mr. Strachey and order his deportation was one of far-reaching consequence. It was known that the order for the arrest and deportation of Mr. Strachey was one of far-reaching consequence before it was issued, and it was a decision of the kind that should not have been made at least without the authorization of the Secretary of Labor.

I feel that I can properly protest in this matter without the danger of being classed as a Communist. Mr. Strachey about a year ago in an article in the January issue of the American Mercury paid me the doubtful compliment of comparing my ideas with those of Adolf Hitler. I, in turn, do not feel that his notion of a social program based on the theory of the class struggle has any particular validity in the United States.

To forestall a lengthy legal brief from your office, I might say that I also realize that Mr. Strachey, an English subject, has no civil rights under the Constitution of the United States. Nevertheless this country, as well as England, has well-established traditions of free speech. These traditions are well stated in the opinions of the late Justice Holmes. The great justice is hardly in his grave before a determined effort is made to disregard these traditions and set them aside.

There is a wide-spread effort in this country today to make people believe that our democratic institutions are threatened by radicals who "predict that capitalism is doomed and that the alternative is certain to be fascism or communism." In order to save the right of free speech the exponents of this position propose to abolish freedom of speech for the time being.

I want to say that thinking people today generally realize that the democratic institutions of this country cannot long endure with 20 percent of the people on poor relief and another 20 percent self-sustaining but without income, while at the same time 1 percent of the people at the top of the social pyramid own 60 percent of the Nation's wealth. In 1929 one-tenth of 1 percent of the people of the United States had an income as great as the total income of 47,000,000 people at the bottom of the social pyramid.

I need not tell you that a great many eminently conservative people of wealth in the United States realize fully the implication of what is happening to the capitalist system throughout the world. These men were discussing, even while Mr. Hoover was still President, the possible necessity for a right-wing dictatorship in order to maintain their vested interests. I think this fact was well brought out by the testimony of Gen. Smedley Butler a few months ago before the Dickstein Committee.

It is my opinion that the great concentration of wealth and income on the one hand and the great technological capacity of the country on the other have created difficulties which cannot be solved without a complete reorganization of our economic system.

I believe it is the duty of every intelligent American at this time to try to secure all the enlightenment possible on the nature of our economic system and the manner in which it operates. I believe that an understanding of our economic difficulties necessarily requires familiarity with the teachings of Adam Smith and the classical economists, with the teachings of Karl Marx and his followers, with the work of Thorstein Veblen and the Technocrats, and with the various statistical material made available by research organizations and by the various departments of the United States Government.

Many responsible persons have come to the conclusion that the economic system under which we operate in the United States,

commonly known as "capitalism", is rapidly approaching the end of the period when it will work. After all, it does not constitute an effort to overthrow the Government or incite to violence merely to come to the conclusion that the capitalist system is doomed, and to state one's opinion to this effect. Certainly this is not a crime in the United States or England, although, of course, it is criminal to make such a statement in Italy or Germany.

I notice by the newspapers that Prof. Harold Laski, of the London School of Economics, is to speak in New York City next week. In my humble opinion Professor Laski is the most intelligent and competent political observer in the world today. I have not read his latest book, but from certain reviews which have appeared in the press I would be led to infer that Professor Laski has come to very much the same conclusions that have been reached by Mr. Strachey.

The difference between the two, as I see it, is that Mr. Strachey has come to the conclusion that capitalism is doomed, that it is not worth saving, and that the alternative is communism, to be achieved by the instrument of the class struggle; which program he has accepted with enthusiasm.

Professor Laski has apparently come to the same conclusion about the ultimate fate of capitalism. The book reviews indicate that in his last book Professor Laski feels the people will not be given opportunity to gain political control through democratic action. He seems to feel that the capitalists will impose a dictatorship before the people have an opportunity to gain political control. If this should occur, Mr. Laski and Mr. Strachey presumably would be agreed as to the nature of the weapon that remained at their disposal. Professor Laski comes to this conclusion not jubilantly but with profound sorrow.

If Mr. Strachey is to be deported, then it seems to me that the door is also open for the deportation of Mr. Laski. If Mr. Hearst should insist upon such deportation, I presume that your Department would obligingly comply.

If this treatment is to be accorded eminent subjects of foreign nations, the way is opened to deprive the average American citizen of his traditional rights. In fact, one need but read the program of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the bills which have already been introduced in Congress by the Hearstlings to know that this is a part of the general plan and merely the beginning of a process which calls for the abandonment of the traditional American and English rights of freedom of speech. These bills would make it a crime for an American citizen to discuss and criticize the workings of the economic system, just as it is now a crime to do so in Germany and Italy.

In the name of America's best traditions, I wish to protest, Mr. Commissioner, against the action that you are taking.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS R. AMLIE.

BUTTER SUBSTITUTES

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, for several years past I have had a bill pending before the Committee on Agriculture of the House which, if passed, will prevent the manufacture and sale of butter substitutes in the United States. This bill has a threefold purpose. First, it will be a contribution to the health of the people of the United States, particularly the growing children of our land. Second, it will prevent a fraud in the manufacture and production of a necessary food. In the final instance, Mr. Speaker, it will aid 4,500,000 dairymen in America whose condition today is desperate. The A. A. A. has done nothing for the dairyman. It has, in fact, made his condition more grievous.

Two years ago I called the attention of the House to the fact that under the modern scheme of racketeering there was grave danger of the racketeer in the metropolitan areas relabeling and selling this counterfeit food as butter. I hold in my hand today a report from the assistant district attorney of the Federal district of Boston, in which he states that in 1934 there were shipped into the Boston area some 375,000 pounds of oleomargarine and butter substitutes, which were relabeled and sold as butter by the racketeers. I claim that that condition is general throughout the metropolitan areas of the United States. There are manufactured in the United States today some 250,000,000 pounds of this counterfeit food. A prosecution, ably conducted by Charles A. Rome, assistant United States attorney, of the Boston, Mass., district, under the direction of the present splendid Attorney General of the United States, brought 20 peddlers of bogus butter to justice. This brings the fact to light that while there are butter substitutes in the United States this counterfeit and fraud will be perpetrated upon the people of the United States. Canada, with only 10,000,000 people and moderate in worldly goods, adopted this law 10 years ago. My bill is a counterpart of the Canadian legislation. The enactment of this legislation will protect the public health and will give economic succor to the long-suffering dairymen.

Possible objection to the bill on the part of American producers comes from the cottonseed-oil group. Some three or four hundred thousand dollars' worth of that product goes into the production of this synthetic butter. On the other hand, the dairymen of the United States are buying a hundred million dollars' worth of cottonseed products for feed for their cattle. The beef industry sells something like a million and a half dollars' worth of beef stearin for this product. With the buying power of the dairymen enhanced by the passage of this act, the beef industry will sell $25,000,000 worth more beef to the dairymen. No other national group will be unfavorably affected by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill of mine comes from the committee, I bespeak the kindly consideration of this House for it. I repeat, it is in the interest of the health of the people of the United States and will give succor to 4,500,000 dairymen whom the A. A. A. and the administration have ignored.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman's bill seek to eliminate the manufacture and sale of butter substitutes?

Mr. CULKIN. That is what it does. It is patterned after the Canadian law which has been in effect in that country for 10 years. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday, tomorrow, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 172.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 172

Resolved, That rule XXIV of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, amended by striking out paragraph 6 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"6. On the first Tuesday of each month after disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, the Speaker shall direct the Clerk to call the bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar. Should objection be made by two or more Members to the consideration of any bill or resolution so called, it shall be recommitted to the committee which reported the bill or resolution and no reservation of objection shall be entertained by the Speaker. Such bills and resolutions, if considered, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. No other business shall be in order on this day unless the House, by two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith, shall otherwise determine. On such motion debate shall be limited to 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against said motion.

"On the third Tuesday of each month after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, the Speaker may direct the Clerk to call the bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar, preference to be given to omnibus bills containing bills or resolutions which have previously been objected to on a call of the Private Calendar. All bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar so called, if considered, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Should objection be made by two or more members to the consideration of any bill or resolution other than an omnibus bill, it shall be recommitted to the committee which reported the bill or resolution and no reservation of objection shall be entertained by the Speaker.

"Omnibus bills shall be read for amendment by paragraph, and no amendment shall be in order except to strike out or to reduce amounts of money stated or to provide limitations. Any item or matter stricken from an omnibus bill shall not thereafter during the same session of Congress be included in any omnibus bill.

"Upon passage of any such omnibus bill, said bill shall be resolved into the several bills and resolutions of which it is composed, and such original bills and resolutions, with any amendments adopted by the House, shall be engrossed, where necessary, and proceedings thereon had as if said bills and resolutions had been passed in the House severally.

"In the consideration of any omnibus bill the proceedings as set forth above shall have the same force and effect as if each Senate and House bill or resolution therein contained or referred to were considered by the House as a separate and distinct bill or resolution."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the resolution. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], would permit, I would like to ask him a question or two on procedure.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would like to have the point of order disposed of first.

Mr. BLANTON. Whether or not I would press the point of order would depend on the gentleman's answers. If I could ask the gentleman a question or two, probably it would save discussion.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would rather hear the point of order before we proceed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that this resolution is not privileged from the Committee on Rules; that the Committee on Rules has no authority, in the way that this rule was introduced and passed upon by the committee and reported, to report such a resolution to the House. Only a joint resolution passed by both the House and Senate, and signed by the President, could authorize this House to pass an omnibus bill, embracing the amounts carried in many private bills, and then, after passage, send all of such private bills to the Senate as bills regularly engrossed and passed by the House, as this rule proposes, when they were not so engrossed and passed.

For a hundred years it has been the practice in the House of Representatives that all bills involving a charge upon the Treasury must be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, unless otherwise considered by unanimous consent. The purpose of that is very apparent, because where bills are considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, the rule changes entirely. They are absolutely in charge of the one who has charge of the legislation on the floor that day. The one in charge of that legislation can move the previous question at any time and shut off debate.

Under this particular rule there could and probably would be thousands of bills, which in the last quarter of a century have been killed by this House, old bills, hoary with age and time, bills a hundred years old, involving millions of dollars, that could be put back on the calendar, and not a Member of this House would have an opportunity to even raise his voice to show why he made objection to their passage.

Unless there be two Members simultaneously objecting to it, the bill would be passed. That would necessitate an entire change of procedure. It would necessitate a Member who was conscientiously studying and watching improper bills going around to the offices of other Members and making an argument in the Member's office to show why a certain bill should not be passed, in order to get someone to object to it. That is not a part of the duty of a Member of the House of Representatives of this great Congress.

I have been here 18 years. I have never arbitrarily objected to a bill in my life. I have never objected to a meritorious bill. Every bill that I have ever objected to has been a bill that I conscientiously studied and looked up the facts and thought it was a bad bill. Some have been bills, like the Sevier heirs bill, a hundred years old and involving a hundred million dollars. I stopped that bill and finally killed it. But it could be revived and passed under this rule.

When I have objected to certain bills and some of my colleagues have told me the facts which would show there was reason for passing the bill and convinced me of their merit, I have universally withdrawn my objection and helped to pass the bill where there was merit in it.

I recognize full well that instances have arisen when through anger some Member has arbitrarily objected to practically all bills called up that night, but that is the exception.

Now, this is a radical change in the procedure of the House. It is an overturning of the rules that have been in existence for a hundred years, and, Mr. Speaker, if this rule were passed, we might as well take the Treasury door off its hinges and leave it wide open without a guard and let every person in the United States who wanted a big handout of several hundred thousand dollars reach his long, hairy arm in and take out what he wanted.

With this proposed rule passed it will be impossible to prevent the passage of the numerous bad bills which have been favorably reported through the years gone by. All will be passed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is not a quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 38]

Adair	Dickstein	Houston	Pierce
Allen	Dirksen	Johnson, Okla.	Rabaut
Andrews, N. Y.	Doutrich	Johnson, W. Va.	Ramsay
Arends	Dunn, Miss.	Kahn	Rayburn
Bacon	Dunn, Pa.	Kennedy, Md.	Robsion, Ky.
Bankhead	Farley	Kimball	Ryan
Beam	Ferguson	Kleberg	Sabath
Bland	Fiesinger	Kramer	Schaefer
Boileau	Flannagan	Kvale	Seger
Bolton	Fletcher	Lamneck	Shannon
Bulwinkle	Ford, Calif.	Lesinski	Smith, Wash.
Cannon, Wis.	Fulmer	McGehee	Smith, W. Va.
Carden	Gambrill	McGroarty	Snell
Casey	Gehrmann	McKeough	Snyder
Cavicchia	Goldsborough	McLean	Somers
Chapman	Granfield	McMillan	Stack
Claiborne	Greenway	McSwain	Steagall
Clark, Idaho	Greenwood	Meeks	Stewart
Cooper, Ohio	Griswold	Merritt, Conn.	Terry
Crosby	Hamlin	Mitchell, Ill.	Tobey
Crowther	Hancock, N. C.	Norton	Truax
Cummings	Harter	O'Malley	Warren
Dear	Healey	Palmisano	Werner
Dempsey	Hess	Pearson	Withrow
DeRouen	Hollister	Peyser	Wood

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-one Members are present, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to hear me just a moment further on the point of order.

I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the Rules Committee, with all of its power, has no authority to bring in a rule that will take away from all of the 435 Representatives of the people in the House of Representatives their representative capacity, their privilege of representing the people of the United States as Members of different districts in Congress, with the inherent right to be heard on public questions, especially upon legislation coming up in the House that takes large sums of money out of the Treasury.

Now, if this rule is passed, it will take away from every Member of this House, except the chairman of the committee in charge of legislation on private bill day, the right to be heard, the inherent right to be heard, in his representative capacity on legislation and his right to protest against the passage of bad bills that will wrongfully take large sums of money from the Public Treasury. Why, the one in charge of legislation at that time could move the previous question immediately if he wanted to, for such bills are to be considered in the House.

If the Rules Committee has authority to bring in this kind of rule, Mr. Speaker, I submit to the Chair in all earnestness it has authority to bring in a rule on the floor of this House that will prevent any Member of the House of Representatives, except a member of the Rules Committee, from being heard on any kind of bill that comes up in the House. It would permit the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, to bring in a rule that would force the consideration of

every supply bill, of every big appropriation bill, to be heard without any debate in the House instead of in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Why, the chairman would have the authority to move the previous question any time he wanted to and prevent every Member on the floor except himself from being heard.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman knows that in passing on a point of order the Chair cannot take into consideration the effect of a resolution or bill that may be pending; that is a matter that must be considered by the membership itself with respect to the legislation in question.

Mr. BLANTON. The present occupant of the chair is one of the best parliamentarians in the House, and he knows that is the situation; he knows that the Rules Committee has that power; it has the power to take away from every Representative here his representative capacity.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The Rules Committee brings in gag rules right along, as it has a perfect right to, rules which take away from the gentleman the very rights he is now talking about, yet he votes for them.

Mr. BLANTON. Of all the gag rules that have been brought into the House since I have been here, from both the Republican and the Democratic side, this is the quintessent prince [laughter] of gag rules that takes away from a Representative his rights, capacities, and privileges as a Member of Congress.

Mr. MICHENER. I know, but it is just progressive; it is getting better every day, more stringent.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, of course, if the House wants to tie its hands and feet and put a gag in its mouth; if it wants to put a bandage around its eyes and stuff up its ears so it can neither see, nor hear, nor talk, nor walk, nor even crawl, why, let it do so, by passing this unwise, unsound rule.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield, although I am through.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman from Texas explain to the House why it is any different from action the House itself has taken on legislation——

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania again is going into politics.

Mr. RICH. Why is it any different for the Rules Committee to take power from the Members of Congress than it is for Members of Congress to turn their power over to the President of the United States?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not discussing partisan politics. I am in favor of some of the rules that the Rules Committee brings in to carry out the policies of the Chief Executive of this Nation, so he can put his policies into effect. I am in favor of that kind of rule and have supported them.

Mr. RICH. The only trouble is that the Chief Executive of the Nation is doing those things that are contrary to the rules; and the American people will not stand for it.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, that is politics, pure and simple. If we pass this proposed rule, we are taking our means of properly representing our constituents away from ourselves respecting our own procedure. But I have done my duty in making this point of order and in registering my objection to this rule. I have performed my duty.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, rule XI, paragraph 45, reads as follows:

> The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, namely: The Committee on Rules, on rules, joint rules, and order of business.

The resolution under discussion is a resolution amending rule XXIV of the House of Representatives. This disposes of the point of order.

The only reason I can see that this point of order was raised, having absolutely no merit, and not having been pressed in any way with sincerity, was in order to give the gentleman a chance to take the floor and attack this resolution before its introducer, the Chairman of the Committee on Rules, who has charge of the debate in this House on this rule, has had an oportunity to say a word.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is a Daniel come to judgment.

The SPEAKER. In disposing of a point of order it is not within the province of the Chair to consider the effect, or what may be the effect, of the passage of any rule or legislation which may be pending. After all, rules reported by the Committee on Rules must be considered and acted upon by a majority of the House, which action, of course, is controlling.

The gentleman from New Jersey has read from clause 45 of rule XI, which, with the permission of the House, the Chair will reread:

> The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, namely: The Committee on Rules, on rules, joint rules, and order of business.

The pending resolution proposes to amend the rules of the House, it relates to the order of business in the House, and, under the rule the Chair has just read, is made a matter of privilege.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is this resolution subject to the Ramseyer rule?

If it is, I make the point of order that the report does not comply with that rule.

The SPEAKER. The Ramseyer rule, to which the gentleman refers, has to do with reports of committees on bills which amend the statutes. This resolution proposes to amend the rules of the House, and therefore does not come within the provisions of clause 2a of rule XIII, the so-called "Ramseyer rule." The Chair, therefore, does not think that the Ramseyer rule applies to this report of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. Speaker, there should not be so much excitement over a matter which has been before the House for so long a time. The reason we called this resolution up today is to dispose of it, as it was on the program for today and we hoped to take up the Private Calendar on Friday next to try out this new rule.

I must correct some misstatements made by the gentleman from Texas about not giving him time. The gentleman well knows that in the presence of several others this morning I said I would give him 10 minutes in opposition to the rule. So his repeated statement that he was not to be given any time is quite beside the fact.

Mr. Speaker, under the guise of a point of order the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] proceeded to take the time to discuss the merits of the bill. The gentleman spoke about one man being entitled to certain constitutional rights in this House in connection with legislation. This rule attempts to stop one man from holding up the proceedings of this House. [Applause.] That man when he is talking could himself be stopped by any Member of the House objecting to his speaking out of order or under the guise of a reservation of objection.

Something was said to the effect that the Rules Committee could not provide for the consideration in the House rather than in the Committee of the Whole of certain legislation. That is not the fact. The Rules Committee can, and often does, provide for such consideration and could do so as to a general supply bill. The Rules Committee could provide that it be considered in the House rather than in the Committee of the Whole.

What does this rule really do? This rule has been considered thoroughly for 9 months by the Rules Committee. Every Member of the House has been written to several times. Hundreds of ideas have been collected. The proceedings of all the parliamentary bodies of the world with similar situations have been examined, and after days and

days of thorough consideration by the Rules Committee this rule was brought out for the purposes of serving the Members of this House and to prevent the disgraceful proceedings we have seen occur here in connection with the consideration of the Private Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides 2 days a month for the consideration of the Private Calendar. It provides that on the first Tuesday the individual bills will be called up, and if objection is made by two Members the bills shall be recommitted automatically to the committee which reported them, such as the Claims Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, and so forth. The rule reported some weeks ago provided for three objectors. After reconsideration the Rules Committee reduced the requirement to two objections. That was a compromise. Why did we require at least two? Because we have seen it happen in this House that where some one Member's bill was objected to, he immediately proceeded because he was "mad"—and that is the only word that describes the situation—to object to every bill on the calendar. We thought two objections would make it a little harder for the irascible one to get a partner or a pal to join with him in "knocking out" the whole calendar.

Mr. EAGLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would prefer to finish my statement first.

Mr. EAGLE. Replying to that remark of my friend, I do not want it forgotten that I will do the same thing during the rest of this session if one man can continue to stop the consideration of an honest bill like the one I had up for consideration last session.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We are trying to meet the gentleman's objection, and I know he is sympathetic with what we are proposing here.

Mr. EAGLE. I am entirely so.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, we are hoping that the objections will not be arbitrary. Two objections are required. Of course, you cannot look into men's minds, but there is a feeling in this House that many times an objection has been made arbitrarily and sometimes by self-appointed objectors, with no official or even unofficial standing.

If two objections are made, the bill is recommitted to the committee which reported the bill. That committee may take those bills to which objection has been made and put them in an omnibus bill.

Mr. Speaker, before I get to that subject, may I say that in connection with the first objections we prevent any reservations of objection. We prevent speeches. I will admit that is possibly a controversial point, but most of the speeches I have heard here, and maybe some of you will agree with me, were not directed to even the merits of the bill. There were speeches on collateral matters, for consumption back home or just a blanket charge against this, that, or the other type of bills, or advanced under the guise of protecting the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, the crux of this bill is to stop this talk. You must understand there is no right of "reservation of objection" under the rules of the House. That practice is violently abused every morning, which could be cut off instantly by a call for the regular order. This abuse should not be permitted unless a Member is in earnest and desires to state his case. If he is in earnest, he can get permission to talk by unanimous consent. I am sure this House will not deny this right to a man, particularly the proponent of a bill, if he asks such unanimous consent in order to explain the bill for a few minutes.

On the third Tuesday of each month the committees are authorized to bring in or to have on the calendar on that day omnibus bills. As I said before on the floor, we hope the committee will set aside a select subcommittee of men who have not previously reported bills, and that this select committee will go through these objected-to bills and will pick out the ones they think should have their day in the House and bring them in in an omnibus bill preferably, and, if possible, bringing in bills relating to one subject, like compensation bills, tort bills, and the various subjects before the committees. We hope the committee will not perfunctorily include in an omnibus bill every bill that has been objected to. If the committees do this, then the question will be before the Rules Committee as to whether or not we should make a further effort to change this rule.

The Rules Committee holds no brief for this rule as a cure-all; perhaps it will not work; it is however, an honest attempt to give the Members of the House a chance to have their private bills passed upon.

On the third Tuesday of each month the Private Calendar is called again, and on that calendar there may be private individual bills and omnibus bills. The omnibus bills are called first. They are read for amendment by paragraphs. Any item can be stricken out, debate can be had on them, and any Member who objected to the bill before, or any other Member, can move to strike out the paragraph. If he can convince the House that the bill should not be passed, the House will agree with him. Then when the omnibus bills are passed they are broken down into individual bills and sent to the Senate.

I do not believe any individual on the Rules Committee had any particular bill in mind. Some have introduced very few private bills. However, we feel there never has been a fair chance for the consideration of these private bills.

In the last 30 years only on two occasions have private bills been considered under any rule of the House. There was a statement here today by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that this rule of the House for the consideration of the Private Calendar has stood for 100 years—the method whereby you take up bills by unanimous consent. There is no such rule of the House. There never was such a rule of the House. There is a rule of the House for the consideration of private bills, but it has not worked because of a filibuster started against it the first time we attempted to use it.

We are here now with a new proposition in an attempt to stop such a filibuster. Let me state also, and this may sound a little strange, I have never comprehended why we do have so-called "official objectors" on either side of this aisle. It strikes me as a creation that is in itself offensive. On the opening of Congress, the majority, in its caucus, and the present minority, in its conference, elect members to the Claims Committee and the Military Affairs Committee and the Public Lands Committee and other committees which report private bills. The House then itself elects these men to the committees. They have faith in the members of those committees. There are always fine men and women on those committees. The committees report these private bills, usually unanimously, and yet in spite of this we have "official objectors", a supercommittee, as it were, sitting in the House overruling these standing committees of the House, committees of our own creation. I never could appreciate how such a system ever developed. It is not according to any rules of the House. Of course, some of the objectors, as I have said, are self-appointed, self-constituted "guardians of the Treasury", trying to prevent, in some instances, $100 being paid to a poor woman whose husband was injured, and at the same time voting for millions to eradicate the bollweevil or the Mediterranean fly or some similar insect in his district.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I remember very well having received several letters from the gentleman, who is the Chairman of the Rules Committee, with regard to a correction of this rule, and not having had a chance to consider the rule before, I would like to make a suggestion or call his attention to that part of the rule on page 2, beginning at line 19, which provides that the omnibus bill when it is presented shall be read for amendment by paragraphs. I think this rule possibly ought to go far enough to provide that when an omnibus bill is reported each private bill shall be set out in a separate paragraph.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It will be, I am sure. The mechanics of working out the resolution are just that, and that is the only way it could be done. At present every omnibus bill that comes into the House, for instance, from the Pensions Committee has each item as a separate paragraph, and that method meets the intention of this measure.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. It seems to me as if this bill is written more from the viewpoint of the Committee on Claims than any other committee. As I look at it, the Committee on Claims and the Committee on Military Affairs are the ones that produce most of the private bills.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Naval Affairs, of course, would rank with Military Affairs.

Mr. FADDIS. Yes. The resolution provides, in line 20, page 2, that no amendment shall be in order except to strike out or to reduce amounts of money stated or to provide limitations. This does not give us an opportunity in the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Naval Affairs to strike out anything unless a certain amount of the appropriation is to be stricken.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, the striking out is separate. You can strike out the whole provision, strike out or reduce. For instance, if it is a bill for the relief of John Jones you can strike the whole bill out.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman state how many objections it takes to an omnibus bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. There can be no objection to an omnibus bill, it is read for and is open for amendment. There can be debate on the amendments, and amendments may be offered to strike out or reduce or offer limitations. These amendments will afford opportunity for anyone to express objection to the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman going to permit any amendment to this resolution?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Well, I have not thought of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman give a little thought to it now? [Laughter.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am generally around when the Private Calendar is taken up, and the gentleman from New York is usually here. If we have an omnibus bill before the House, the gentleman knows well, and I know, that every 7 out of 10 men on the floor on Private Calendar day will be men who have bills on the calendar. Assuming you have an omnibus bill up, and everybody on the floor of the House is interested in that omnibus bill, and I rise and move to strike out a certain bill. Do you think I am going to get support from Members who have their bills on that calendar?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman does not think that Members are going to do any logrolling here?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not going to say anything against any Member, but the gentleman and I both know what has transpired in the past. Members do not object when they have bills on the calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I hope that will not happen.

Mr. COCHRAN. Let us hope. [Laughter.]

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Why not try out objections by three Members rather than have this provision as to omnibus bills?

Mr. O'CONNOR. This matter has been before the House for 1 month at least. Every Member was invited to appear before the Committee on Rules and present his objections. Notwithstanding that invitation we have not heard any Member of the House object to this resolution, except one, and that is not the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I agree that sometimes bills have met with arbitrary objection. But it seems to me that if it required three objections there would not be any arbitrary objection. The gentleman from New York is interested in an $800,000 matter.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not know whether it is still extant, but I do know it has been kicked around here for about 17 years—a bill I inherited from my predecessors and do not even know the parties concerned.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I know that the gentleman is very much interested in a bill carrying $800,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is wrong. I have no interest in the bill, except that it has been here for about 17 years, and the Federal Reserve, as well as the Secretary of State, say that a gross injustice was done the claimant. Just because the amount is large, there has been no opportunity of passing it through the House. It has always been objected to arbitrarily, and no one can honestly deny that.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The gentleman understands that I did not object to the bill; but I do know this: That the objectors in the House have been so liberal that the President has had to veto several bills that have been passed by the objectors. In this way every bill will have to go to the President, and the President will have to be the objectors' committee and not the House, and the Lord knows the President has enough to do without legislating for the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not agree with the gentleman that any more bills will go to the President than go now.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. If committees followed the suggestion of the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and appointed subcommittees whose functions it would be to consider the bills that were referred back to the committee which had met with two objections, and the proponents and opponents of the bill were invited to come before the subcommittee and took advantage of that opportunity, would they not have more opportunity and longer time to be heard and a better opportunity to clearly state their case than they have under the present rule?

Mr. O'CONNOR. We hope that will work out and that when objections are made and the bill goes back to the committee, that the committee will invite those objectors in to state their reasons; and, if they can convince the committee, then the committee will not put that bill in an omnibus bill. I am willing to wager, however, that on very few occasions will the objectors show up.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. In case an omnibus bill is under consideration, would it be necessary to finish that omnibus bill in its entirety before a motion to adjourn would be in order? How would you protect the omnibus bill itself and also the other bills that are included in the omnibus bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. You cannot protect bills against a filibuster.

Mr. BLOOM. What happens to the omnibus bill if there is no quorum present and an adjournment is had?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It would, in my opinion, be still pending when the Private Calendar of omnibus bills is taken up again.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. Since we have the right to cut off useless talk at any time by calling for the regular order, what is the reason for prohibiting a reservation of the right to object? Under this proposed rule one cannot reserve the right to object.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. MOTT. What is the merit in prohibiting that since we already have the right to stop anyone engaging in useless talk by calling for the regular order?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I might say it was more or less a question of psychology. Reservations of objection would not be attempted if there is a rule against them, whereas reservations of objection on one bill here at the present time often takes an hour. Further, if you cut off a man, he gets mad. That is what happens. If you have a rule that there can be no reservations of objection, then you will have no talk. That is the theory of this rule.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MILLARD. Did the gentleman's committee consider the fact about the age of these bills that go into the omnibus bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is within the discretion of the reporting committees. Any arbitrary rule cannot be laid down. Some committees already have such rules. Rules Committee did not care to interfere with the standing committees of the House, which are on a parity with all committees.

Mr. MILLARD. Does the gentleman not think it rather dangerous to put in bills 20 years' old into an omnibus bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Offhand I would not say. It depends on the particular bill.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. What good reason is there for limiting the amendments that may be offered? We are limited here by the language at the bottom of page 2:

> And no amendment shall be in order except to strike out or to reduce amounts of money stated or to provide limitations.

There are cases when other amendments than those provided for are desirable.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It was not called to the attention of the Rules Committee that there are any other cases where honest amendments are necessary. What is attempted to be done in that provision is similar to what we do in preventing a reservation of objection. We prevent pro forma amendments. That is all we attempted to do—to prevent amendments striking out the last word, and so forth. We thought by the provision we have inserted there about amendments we had met every situation where a necessary amendment could be offered to the paragraph.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Would not the gentleman accomplish his purpose by making it out of order to offer pro forma amendments?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That might not meet the entire satisfaction. We did want to stop filibustering. We want to do business in the consideration of the Private Calendar. Members are often more concerned with that calendar individually than with other measures before the House.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Clarifying language is very frequently required in these private bills.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I believe if the gentleman had an amendment which was of a different nature than strictly permitted under this rule and offered it, he would be granted unanimous consent to do so. He could always request unanimous consent to offer it in spite of this rule.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The sum and substance of this bill with the omnibus measure in it provides that every bill that is reported by the regular standing committees of the House will be passed in the House, because no bill which will be rereferred to them, will be excluded from the omnibus bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If that happens, as I stated before, then something will have to be done further about the rule.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. But, in my opinion, that is what will happen. Personally I am not going to be on the Private Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We shall have to meet that situation when we come to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this rule has been referred to as a "gag" rule. Why, it is just the opposite. This rule takes away the power and ability of one man in the House to "gag" the entire Membership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to say anything in opposition to this change in the rules, because I realize that the method in effect for considering private bills in the past has been somewhat unsatisfactory. I believe, however, that the reason for this is not so much the method of consideration, as the fact that the proper amount of time has not been given this class of legislation. The Private Calendar is a sort of stepchild, as far as this House is concerned, and generally speaking has been considered only when the House had nothing else to do. This proposed rule requires that 2 days in each month be devoted to the Private Calendar. If we would adopt that provision, and perhaps a provision that there should be three objections before a bill finally goes off the calendar, I think we would have a fairly satisfactory rule as far as the Private Calendar is concerned.

Now, if we adopt this rule, what will happen is just as was suggested by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK], namely, every bill which has the favorable report of a committee of this House will be passed. The first objection, that is, the objection which is made when the bill first comes up as a separate bill, is not going to count for anything, because the bill will then go back to the committee, and it is only reasonable to suppose that the committee which reported the bill in the first instance, after giving it what we must assume was careful consideration will again report it in an omnibus bill. Now, when the bill does come back as part of an omnibus bill, there is no chance, in my opinion, to strike it out although it may be quite objectionable.

Those of us who have been here when omnibus pension bills were considered know that those bills have gone through in practically every instance by unanimous consent. Why? Because almost every Member of the House had a bill included in that omnibus bill. This is no particular reflection on Members of the House, nor is any criticism implied. The result follows, however, because each Member is interested in his own bills, which he naturally regards as meritorious, and is not concerned about any of the many other provisions of the omnibus bill. The same situation will be true under this plan, because most of those who are in attendance in the House when an omnibus bill comes up will be those interested in bills contained in that bill. It is too much to expect that they will vote to strike out a bill included in the omnibus bill upon the very small amount of information which they can get during the discussion which may be allowed incident to a motion to strike out that provision. So the result is going to be that we will pass every provision of the omnibus bill.

I think it is a very serious objection to this resolution that there is no provision for a reservation of objection, because without that provision there is nothing in the record to show why the Member who made the objection did so. The committee to which the bill is recommitted should have the benefit of that information. It would be shown in the RECORD, if Members were permitted to make a reservation of objection.

Furthermore, I know from my own experience as one of those who has had the unpleasant duty of objecting to some of these bills, that it is frequently to the advantage of a proponent of a bill to have this reservation of objection, because it gives him an opportunity to furnish information which has not been contained in the report of the committee. The committee reports generally contain the most important points of information regarding the bill, yet very frequently those reports, because they can not be too voluminous, will fail to give essential information which can only be developed by a reservation of objection.

My judgment is that the adoption of this rule will not solve the difficulties which have been met in the past in the consideration of private bills, but will add new ones, and will result in the passage of many bills which are not just claims against the Government.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House ought to understand this proposed rule and know what they are voting on before they vote.

In the first place, instead of being a rule to provide for more prompt and proper consideration of the Private Calendar, it is a rule which will do just the opposite. It will prevent proper consideration of the Private Calendar. It puts a man who objects to a bill, conscientiously, in the position of having to raise a point of no quorum every time

a bad bill is reached and he does not have anyone else who will join with him in objecting. It puts him in a position where he is free to take that position.

In the second place, it provides that no reservation of objection shall be permitted. The reservation of objection and explanation which the proponents of bills make, constitutes one of the very best features of the method by which we handle the Private Calendar, because if a man has a decent case and a decent bill, he does not object to a reservation of objection and he does not object to getting up and telling what the good points of his bill are.

Then there is a provision for an omnibus bill. If we are going to have an omnibus bill, let us look at the picture that will be presented. Suppose an omnibus bill is brought out by the Committee on Military Affairs, and suppose in that bill there is one item which goes through which wipes out a charge of desertion against a man who has no business to have any such thing done, and that there are along with that bill 8 or 10 others that are meritorious.

That one fly in the ointment will spoil the whole bill and the President will have to veto the whole bill. That is the way the thing will work, and I want the House to know just how it will work.

Mr. NICHOLS. Why could not that be corrected by simply offering an amendment to the bill at the time it was up for consideration to take that paragraph out?

Mr. TABER. That would be all right if it happened to be done, but all wrong if it did not happen to be done.

Mr. NICHOLS. If the objectors are here, as they ordinarily are, they could exercise that privilege.

Mr. TABER. There are lots of bad bills that will get into the omnibus bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will find, on page 3, that, if an omnibus bill passes, it is separated.

Mr. BLOOM. It is broken down, and each bill is separated.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. To change the law respecting engrossed bills, we would have to have the Senate agree to this and the President sign it.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct; this would have to be a joint resolution if that were going to be done; there is no question about it; it would have to be a joint resolution; the President would have to sign it, and, even then, I do not know that it would be constitutional; it might take an amendment to the Constitution. That is about it, is it not?

Mr. BLANTON. If anybody raised the question. And the question certainly will be raised when bad bills are passed.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If objectors on the Democratic side of the House and on the Republican side of the House objected to bills and those bills were embodied in an omnibus bill and the omnibus bill passed, never would anyone object to a bill any more, for there would be no use in objecting.

Mr. TABER. It would destroy the morale of those who were trying to protect the integrity of the Treasury.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If the gentleman will yield for a further question, I should like to know whether in the gentleman's experience more personal pressure is not put on for private bills than for public bills by individual Members of the House?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I have never served on the objecting committees. I have objected to some bills that I thought were bad, but I have not had the experience that has been had by the gentleman from Washington, the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], and others who served on these committees.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If the gentleman will accept my statement, there is more personal pressure, more personality that enters into private bills than public bills in that the Claims Committee cannot thoroughly go into the hundreds and hundreds of bills they have.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. From influences both inside and outside of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. It has been my observation, after watching the Private Calendar for 3 or 4 years, that 9 out of 10 objections that are made are made conscientiously. The arbitrary, spiteful objection is very rare; which means, if I am correct in this statement, that every bill that goes into an omnibus bill will be a questionable bill. So if we pass an omnibus bill we pass bad bills by the wholesale. That will be the result.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Every lawyer and parliamentarian of the House knows that if you pass an omnibus bill under a resolution like this you could not afterward separate those amounts carried in the paragraphs of the omnibus bill back into separate bills and send them to the Senate and White House, when they had never been engrossed and passed, unless you had a joint resolution signed by the Senate and President authorizing it.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe you could do it even then unless you had an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. BLANTON. And unless it were passed by the Senate and signed by the President.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We considered that subject and attempted to reach it by the last paragraph of the resolution, on page 3; and we felt that we had met it. The parliamentarians on the gentleman's side agreed with some of the Members on this side that in an omnibus bill just the title of the bills will be referred to, probably in some little detail. The gentleman knows we can pass a bill here just by reading the title.

Mr. TABER. We certainly can make no rule which would permit a bill to be segregated into 15 or 20 bills without the concurrence of the Senate and the President; and, frankly, I do not believe we can even then.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We do it with pension bills.

Mr. TABER. Only because the pension bill cannot be vetoed except en gross.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is the purpose of breaking this down. If the President had an omnibus bill before him, of course, he could not veto one item but would have to veto the entire bill; so we broke down the omnibus bill and separate bills go to the Senate and to the President.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I do not believe this can be done by a resolution of the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We hope so.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe it would be valid. I do not believe any student of the Constitution would say it was valid.

Mr. BLANTON. And the Comptroller General would stop payment.

Mr. TABER. I think he would stop payment of the items; and the Supreme Court certainly would overrule that sort of thing.

I do not believe that we ought to require those who are called upon as a patriotic duty and by their leaders on both sides to make a point of no quorum in order to stop the bills. I do not believe this resolution will bring about the result that the gentleman from New York has intimated he desires.

I think it might be a good thing to increase the number of objectors to two, but I think if we do that we have done all that we ought to do as a try-out for this kind of a proposition. We ought not to put into effect this omnibus proposition.

I hope that the House will vote down the previous question and amend this proposition so that an omnibus bill will not be permitted, with all the mixed-up language there is here and all the involvements there are to make consideration of the Private Calendar almost an impossibility. We have tried for years and years to correct the Private Calendar situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TABER. We have always come back to the proposition of asking unanimous consent of the House to consider the Private Calendar and only permit to be considered bills unobjected to. I do not think this rule will get away from that situation. I do not believe anything can be done along that line unless we try the proposition of two objections, and I am willing to do that if the Members will vote down the previous question and strike out the omnibus business.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The omnibus-bill feature was suggested by a gentleman on that side of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH], than whom there is no better parliamentarian in this House.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. He suggested an omnibus bill and it was practically that suggestion which was carried into this rule. I may say that this is the first time we ever heard from either side of the House an objection to the omnibus feature of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I view with a great deal of sympathy the attempt of the Rules Committee to solve this very difficult problem of the Private Calendar, but I am not at all convinced they have arrived at the correct solution. I think removing the privilege to reserve the right to object is a very serious thing and will prove in the end to be detrimental.

As I understand from the explanation of the gentleman from New York, the Chairman of the Rules Committee [Mr. O'CONNOR], one of the objects of this resolution is to prevent Members from becoming angry at each other. I cannot imagine a situation which would be more conducive to anger on the part of Members than for one Member to have his bill objected to and killed without having an opportunity even to offer an explanation for the bill, or to defend it in any way.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington

Mr. LLOYD. Would not the same result be accomplished by a request to the objecting Member to withhold his objection while unanimous consent to explain the bill is asked?

Mr. MOTT. I do not believe that would solve the problem, and I do not think it would be a proper substitute for reserving the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, it has been very properly said here today that reservation of objection is a thing much abused. We all know, of course, that it has been abused in the past. Members will reserve the right to object, and then proceed to talk about everything except what is pertinent to the bill.

However, we have a well-nigh perfect remedy for stopping that sort of thing. Because we have been lax in the past and have not exercised the right to stop abuse of the privilege of talking is certainly no reason why we should not and cannot exercise it in the future. We can if we want to. I believe when a Member deliberately abuses the privilege of speaking under a reservation of objection that such Member should be immediately called to order. I think the House can easily accustom itself to enforcing this remedy if it will make up its mind to do so.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it not a fact that these reservations of objection in most instances are simply for the opportunity to make a speech, and if the regular order is demanded an objection is made, anyway?

Mr. MOTT. I would not say so.

Mr. PITTENGER. I may say that that has been my observation and my experience.

Mr. MOTT. I do not think that is the general rule. I think it is rather the exception to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, during the last session on several occasions I had bills on the Private Calendar which were called and to which an objection was made. In each instance I requested that the objection be withheld for the purpose of making a short, simple explanation. My recollection is that in nearly every case the explanation satisfied the objector and that the objection was withdrawn.

On the other hand, under the proposed rule, if a bill should come up on the Private Calendar that I did not quite understand, I would be very prone to object to the bill if I thought an objection was merited, but I would not be allowed even to state my reason for objecting. Under the present system, I think we are following a fairer and a better procedure than that. In such a case as I have just mentioned I can, under the present procedure, reserve the right to object, ask the author of the bill a simple question which probably will clear the whole thing up in my mind, and in that case I can then withdraw the objection. The bill can then be passed, as it ought to be passed if it is meritorious.

I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is right in his suggestion that we first try out this new procedure by providing for 2 or possibly 3 objections to start with. This will speed up the procedure, and it will not make anyone justifiably angry on account of an objection. I think if we start that way we can get used to it very easily, and that from then on we can function under the Private Calendar in fairly good order and with reasonable speed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to make any comment on this resolution in addition to those I have already made. I think, however, the Chairman of the Rules Committee misspoke when he said that it was the idea of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] to amend the rules so as to provide for an omnibus bill to carry the bills that were objectionable. As I remember his speech on that subject made several weeks ago, his idea was exactly the opposite. He proposed that the objectors on both sides examine the bills on the Private Calendar—and there are many that are purely formal and that no one can possibly object to—and that these bills be included in an omnibus bill which could be disposed of at once.

This is my recollection of the suggestion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH]. He recommended not that objectionable bills should be passed by the wholesale, but that unobjectionable bills should be passed in this way.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the gentleman is mistaken. The difference between the suggestion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] and the pending suggestion is that the gentleman from New Jersey would set up a supercommittee, elected by the House, to review the bills and that supercommittee would take the objected-to bills and would consider putting them in an omnibus bill, but we think that to set up a supercommittee over the other committees would not be a respectable recognition of the standing committees of the House.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Of course, if there were no such thing as an official objector, the legislative committees

of the House would take their duties much more seriously and many of the bills now reported would be killed in committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is what I have said.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. The fact that we have objectors makes them necessary, because time after time the committees will say to a Member, "We will report out your bill and you can take your chances on the floor." So these official objectors do perform a very necessary function.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have performed my duty when I have expressed my opposition to this bill. No special responsibility rests upon my shoulders to study, investigate, and oppose bad bills. I think the same responsibility rests upon the shoulders of every one of the 435 Members of the House equally to stop bad bills.

When I first came to Congress in 1917, Mr. Garner, who was in charge of the Ways and Means Committee so far as our State was concerned, placed me on the Claims Committee and asked me on behalf of the Membership to watch these claims carefully. You will find in the Claims Committee during the first 3 years I served there a whole book of adverse reports that I filed on unmeritorious-claims bills. You will find one of them involved $100,000,000.

After I went off of that committee I became interested in watching them and I continued to watch them. When Mr. Garner was Speaker of this House he asked me on behalf of the Speaker to watch bad bills, and I was one of those who did it. When Mr. Speaker Rainey was elected Speaker of this House he asked me to be one of those who would watch bad bills and I performed that duty at his request. When the present Speaker of this House was elected he asked me to perform this duty and I have been performing it all the time at the request of those in authority in the House.

The present resolution rose because one of our colleagues, although I did not agree with him, once objected to a bill of my friend, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. EAGLE, and becoming incensed, he stopped all the bills on the calendar.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I objected to that bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; it was the gentleman from Washington who objected to Mr. EAGLE's bill on that occasion.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. And I would object to it again.

Mr. BLANTON. This occasioned all this dissension about private bills. I have seen 50 bills passed here in 1 night with all of these objectors present—good bills that should have been passed, and even then, on such rights, with all objectors watching, once in a while a bad bill would get by and the President would have to veto it.

I have no more interest or responsibility in this matter than any of my colleagues. If the House wants to pass a rule like this, it can do it, but I warn you that just as sure as it is passed it will let every single private bill go by, be passed hereafter, because there will be no way to stop them. You will find every bill on the calendar passed as called, and you will find that some of these bills are 100 years old and will involve millions of dollars that ought not to be thus wasted.

The gentleman from Washington called the attention of the gentleman from New York to his bill, the O'Connor bill, which was up in the last session, involving $800,000. The gentleman from New York is one of the leading attorneys of that city. He is a member of one of the leading law firms there. Suppose his firm had a suit in court involving $800,000, I dare say they would take a week or 10 days or 2 weeks to try it. They would not try it on affidavits. They would try it on the evidence of sworn witnesses.

But every bill that comes here is tried on affidavits. Usually you have only one side presented. You do not have the Government's side presented. There are affidavits from persons that the Membership of the House have never seen, and if they had a chance to examine them on the witness stand probably 9 out of 10 would fail. Are you in favor of trying $800,000 cases in 1 minute, upon affidavits presented by only one side, and the other side not heard? That is the way they will be tried and passed under this rule. There might be here under this proposed rule an omnibus bill that might contain a hundred and fifty bills, involving millions of dollars, which would pass unanimously on affidavits in 2 minutes' time because we could not get Members here who were the authors of such bills to stop it on private-bill night.

I remember in the last session of Congress when one of our distinguished friends from California on the first day of Congress introduced over 300 private bills, and one of them involved $5,000,000,000. Do you want such bills to be put in an omnibus bill and passed in the twinkling of an eye, when no one can be heard, and no one will be allowed to speak against them?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANSLEY. I yield that to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in 1929 I was assigned to the Claims Committee. I am still a member of that body. At the beginning of this Congress I was entitled to the chairmanship of that committee and also to the chairmanship of the Civil Service Committee, which I took instead. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. KENNEDY] is Chairman of the Claims Committee and is undertaking to do a real job in that capacity.

Those who have served on that committee know that members of the committee have, for the most part, at least, rendered a distinct service to the Government, and that they do endeavor to give intelligent consideration to the private bills that come before the committee.

During the 5½ years that I have been a member of the committee the majority of the bills reported from the committee have not been considered because they were not reached on the calendar, or, if they were reached, they were objected to by some Member who had made but a casual examination.

I am not criticizing any Member of this House who opposed bills. I presume he did his duty as he saw it.

The point I make to Members of the House is this: That our constituents back home who claim to have been damaged or to have suffered a loss because of some act of some agency of the Government are the people who are entitled to consideration in this House. They have no other place to go. The only possible method of redress which they have is through a private bill introduced by their Congressman and considered on the floor of this body. If you are not going to give them their day in court, let us say so; do not let us go through this farce that we have been going through here where one man can get up, because his feelings have been ruffled, and object to a bill, which bill never has a chance of consideration.

With reference to the question of reservation of objection, the reason that is in the rule, I think, is because of a suggestion I made to the Rules Committee, and that is this: We find that about 50 percent of the bills reported by the Claims Committee, on an average, are passed. For a large part, at least, they are those to which nobody has any objection. They are the only ones that have been reached so far under the present regulations. Therefore let us try to pass those without any objection, without any reservation of objection, so that the good bills, the ones that everyone thinks are good, will pass on to the Senate and have a chance to become law.

Then we provide under this rule that those to which objection is made shall go back to the Committee on Claims, and it is understood by that committee and by the Committee on Rules that we are going to have a subcommittee of five of the Claims Committee, which has not heretofore considered the bills, review those bills to which objections have been made, and such as they agree shall come out of the committee again will be reported to the full committee for its consideration and for inclusion in an omnibus bill, if the committee so directs. Then, if they come out in an omnibus bill, they will be considered on this floor on their merits. I submit to the Mem-

bers of this body that there is nothing in this procedure that prevents the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] or the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] or the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], or any other gentleman in this House, from stopping those bills if they are meritorious. I do not agree with the insinuations that have been made here today that Members of this House, because they have bills in the omnibus bill, will not stop other bills if such should get in the omnibus bill.

I believe there is enough courage in this House, I believe there are enough Members here who have some regard for their oath of office, to stop any bill if such should not get by under this procedure. I believe they will do it. I believe if the general Membership would not do it, that then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] would do it by making a point of no quorum, and he can always do that under the procedure laid down, as was pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Let us give this method a chance, and let us remember that our constituents deserve the right to their day in court. They are being damaged by trucks of the Post Office Department, by trucks of the Civilian Conservation Corps, by various agencies of this Government, and they do not have any day in court.

Fifty percent of the bills introduced in every Congress are never reached even for consideration under the present system, where one person arbitrarily—and I do not cast any reflection on those who object—can stop the consideration of a bill, and the result is that your constituent and mine have not had their day in court. I am not disturbed about raiding the Treasury. I do not believe any Congress is going to raid the Treasury, but I am disturbed about the failure of Congress to give consideration to the rights of our people who have suffered damages on the part of some agent of the Government, and who are entitled to have a hearing at the hands of the people who represent them.

Let us give a trial to this procedure, and if it does not work out, then we can adopt something else, but certainly under the present procedure the people of this country are not getting a square deal on private bills, and they ought to have that privilege.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. I am in entire accord with what the gentleman says, that every person who has a claim against the Government should have his day in court, and the gentleman has stated correctly that there are many bills on the Private Calendar never reached. That is because the House has neglected the Private Calendar. We do not need to pass this legislation in order to reach those cases. If the House will set aside enough days for the consideration of the Private Calendar, we will obviate that situation which I agree is deplorable.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think we ought to try out this procedure and give the people of this country an opportunity to have their legislation considered on its merits. I do not think any bill ought to be passed by unanimous consent unless it is so meritorious that it is unanimous, and we all know that under the procedure we have here now such is not the case; a man has to get down on his knees and beg someone not to object.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 67 and noes 27.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. TABER. I will.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MCKEOUGH, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. SABATH, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. KVALE, for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. FERGUSON (at the request of Mr. NICHOLS), for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. JENKINS of Ohio), for balance of the week, on account of important business.

To Mr. GRAY of Indiana, for 4 days, on account of important official business.

To Mr. POLK, for 1 week, on account of important business.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] objects to the vote because there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 27, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(Wednesday, Mar. 27, 10 a. m.)

Committee will continue hearings on the President's message (Doc. No. 119) relative to subsidies.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

277. A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting copy of letter addressed to Librarian, Library of Congress, under date of March 7, 1935, and reply thereto dated March 19, 1935, relative to certain records in storage in the Veterans' Administration, no longer of use or value, and recommended for destruction; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

278. A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of activities and expenditures for February 1935, together with a statement of authorizations made during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case (H. Doc. No. 146); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 6803. A bill to authorize funds for the prosecution of works for flood control and protection against flood disasters; without amendment (Rept. No. 486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5789. A bill for the relief of the city of Perth Amboy, N. J.; with amendment (Rept. No. 507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 284. A bill for the relief of John N. Brooks; with amendment (Rept. No. 487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 350. A bill for the relief of Florenz Gutierrez; with amendment (Rept. No. 488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 812. A bill for the relief of Cora A. Bennett; with amendment (Rept. 489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Committee on Claims. H. R. 949. A bill for the relief of Irvin Pendleton; with

amendment (Rept. No. 490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1292. A bill for the relief of Grace McClure; with amendment (Rept. No. 491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1365. A bill for the relief of E. G. Briseno; with amendment (Rept. No. 492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1485. A bill to pay to the Printz-Biederman Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $741.40, money paid as duty on merchandise imported under section 308 of the tariff act; without amendment (Rept. No. 493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1541. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Jotter; with amendment (Rept. No. 494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2674. A bill for the relief of G. Elias & Bro., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3107. A bill for the relief of William Louis Pitthan; with amendment (Rept. No. 496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3218. A bill for the relief of Fred Herrick; with amendment (Rept. No. 497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3230. A bill for the relief of Rufus Hunter Blackwell, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3826. A bill for the relief of John Evans; with amendment (Rept. No. 499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4428. A bill for the relief of Caroline (Stever) Dykstra; with amendment (Rept. No. 500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4567. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Callen; with amendment (Rept. No. 501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4651. A bill for the relief of the Noble County (Ohio) Agricultural Society; with amendment (Rept. No. 502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4942. A bill for the relief of Patrick Henry Walsh; without amendment (Rept. No. 503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EKWALL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5041. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Lela C. Brady and Ira P. Brady for the losses sustained by them by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps; with amendment (Rept. No. 504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. S. 931. An act for the relief of the Concrete Engineering Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Claims. S. 1012. An act for the relief of Ed Symes and wife, Elizabeth Symes, and certain other citizens of the State of Texas; with amendment (Rept. No. 506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6968) to place George K. Shuler on the retired list of the United States Marine Corps; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6297) for the relief of Leon Frederick Ruggles; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3710) for the relief of the heirs at law of Barnabas W. Baker and Joseph Baker; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 7017) to regulate the use of the mails of the United States of America; prohibiting the use of the mails to all matter pertaining or concerning articles or commodities produced, manufactured, sold, or delivered by child labor; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 7018) to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present forms of farm tenancy, to engage in rural rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 7019) to repeal the excise tax on manufactures of furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 7020) providing for the purchase of certain inventions, designs, and methods of aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical and aviation technique of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty, of New York; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: A bill (H. R. 7021) to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILCOX: A bill (H. R. 7022) to authorize the selection, construction, installation, and modification of permanent stations and depots for the Army Air Corps, and frontier air defense bases generally; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7023) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 7024) to authorize the conveyance by the United States to the municipality of Hot Springs, N. Mex., the NE½ of the SE¼ and the NE¼ of the SW¼ sec. 6, T. 14 S., R. 4 W., Hot Springs, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 7025) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to furnish transportation to persons in the service of the United States in the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 7040) to promote safety of life and property at sea and to aid in preventing marine disasters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, regarding the importation of wheat and corn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, regarding a protective tariff on barley and barley malt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, supporting payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, regarding tariffs to protect agriculture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, supporting House bill 2024; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, regarding antireligious outbreaks in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, opposing House bill 3263; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, regarding the construction of a drainage canal to relieve the Sebewaing River Basin; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, regarding a processing tax on livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, regarding the use of ethyl alcohol in gasoline; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, regarding the deportation of aliens on public relief; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, regarding the deportation of undesirable aliens and aliens who are illegally in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEITER: A bill (H. R. 7026) to correct the military record of Nicholas Lauber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 7027) for the relief of Mary Rita Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 7028) for the relief of Okaloosa County, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 7029) for the relief of Mamie E. Schaumburg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DELANEY: A bill (H. R. 7030) to place George K. Shuler on the retired list of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN: A bill (H. R. 7031) for the relief of Capt. Karl Minnigerode; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 7032) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Barringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7033) for the relief of Capt. Roger H. Young; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS: A bill (H. R. 7034) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Pruett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 7035) for the relief of Charles Batini; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7036) granting a pension to John C. Camden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 7037) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the heirs of James Taylor, deceased Cherokee Indian, for the value of certain lands now held by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 7038) granting a pension to Susie A. Harmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEST: A bill (H. R. 7039) for the relief of T. T. East and the Cassidy Southwestern Commission Co., citizens of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5589. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the National Association Opposed to Blue Laws, urging passage of House bill 5850, entitled "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act to control the manufacture, transportation, possession, and sale of alcoholic beverages in the District of Columbia' "; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5590. By Mr. BLAND: Petition of six citizens of Westmoreland County, favoring a uniform Federal old-age-pension law that must be adopted by the States before any Federal aid or relief is available; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5591. By Mr. BOLTON: Petition signed by members of the Roosevelt Parent-Teacher Association of Willoughby Township, Lake County, Ohio, endorsing the Townsend old-age revolving pension bill (H. R. 3977); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5592. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Old Glory Club of Flatbush, Inc., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring House Concurrent Resolution No. 2, withdrawing our recognition of Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5593. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the Common Council of the Borough of Sayreville and the State of New Jersey in session assembled, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5594. By Mr. HULL: Memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature, relating to a protective tariff on barley and barley malt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5595. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Elmer Bullock, Sam Piccolo, Roy Foster, and Sam Scarmardo, of Bryan, Tex., favoring Federal regulation of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5596. Also, petition of John D. Rogers and others, of Navasota, Tex., endorsing House bill 6198; to the Committee on Flood Control.

5597. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution of the delegates of the Veterans Alliance of Essex County, requesting Congress to enact a law classifying all marines, soldiers, and sailors who served in any expedition on foreign shores where their lives were in danger as veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5598. Also, resolution of the New Jersey Society Sons of the Revolution of Titusville, N. J., approving the creation of a Bureau of Alien Deportation in the Department of Justice as provided for in House Joint Resolution No. 69 of the Seventy-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5599. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division No. 1, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the religious situation in Mexico, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5600. Also, resolution of the Council of the City of Los Angeles, at its meeting held on March 21, 1935, relative to the enactment of the Black bill, S. 1518, which provides for the establishment of a 6-hour day for carriers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5601. By Mr. LUCAS: Resolution of the Greene County Association of Rural Mail Carriers of Greene County, Ill., relative to the improvement of mail route roads; to the Committee on Roads.

5602. Also, petition of the members of Farm Bureau and farmers of Scott County, Ill., relative to farm credit relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5603. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of the voters of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the passage, without amendment, of House bill 7598, the so-called "workers unemployment and social-insurance bill"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5604. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Petition requesting the Congress of the United States to promote, initiate, and support any legislation for the purpose of requiring all motor-vehicle fuels to contain ethyl alcohol in a volume of not less than 10 percent of the mixture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5605. Also, petition memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact no livestock processing taxes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5606. By Mr. MERRITT of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of Rowayton and West Redding in the State of Connecticut, protesting against the passage of the public-

utility bills (H. R. 5423 and S. 1725); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5607. By Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee: Petition of the Tennessee Legislature, petitioning the President and the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority to give early and favorable consideration to plans for commencing construction work on the Whites Creek, Chickamauga, and Hiwassee Dams during the year 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5608. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Kenneth W. Sollitt and nine others of Bristol, Vt., protesting against the passage of either House bill 5423 or Senate bill 1725; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5609. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Association of Employees, Long Lines Department, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., New York, concerning the national labor relations bill; to the Committee on Labor.

5610. Also, petition of the Coat and Suit Authority, New York City, regarding the extension of the National Recovery Administration for a period of 2 years as recommended by the President; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5611. Also, petition of Joseph W. Justus, 109 Java Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., and nine other citizens of New York, concerning the Rayburn-Wheeler public-utility bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5612. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of F. V. Winslow and seven others of Montpelier, Vt., opposing the Wheeler public-utility bill (S. 1725) and the Rayburn public-utility bill (H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5613. Also, vote of the Vermont Baptist State Convention, at Ludlow, Vt., on March 22, 1935, representing some 10,000 members, protesting against enactment of the Wheeler or Rayburn bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5614. Also, petition of citizens of Berlin, Vt., opposing the Rayburn public-utility bill (H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5615. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Charles Adolph Wolff, 8633 One Hundred and Ninth Street, Richmond Hill, Long Island, N. Y., and four other citizens, concerning the Rayburn-Wheeler public-utility holding companies bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5616. Also, petition of Francis McKeever, 9705 One Hundred and Eighth Street, Ozone Park, Long Island, N. Y., and 11 other citizens of Ozone Park, concerning the Rayburn-Wheeler public-utility holding companies bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5617. By Mr. STEFAN: Resolution adopted by the Nebraska House of Representatives, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact no livestock processing taxes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5618. Also, resolution adopted by the Nebraska State Senate, asking the Congress of the United States to promote, initiate, and support any legislation for the purpose of requiring all motor-vehicle fuels to contain ethyl alcohol in a volume of not less than 10 percent of the mixture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5619. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the New Jersey Brick Manufacturers Association; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5620. Also, petition of the Sons of the Revolution, New Jersey society; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5621. Also, petition of the mayor and Council of Sayreville, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5622. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of members of the Roosevelt Parent-Teacher Association, Willoughby Township, Lake County, Ohio, heartily endorsing the Townsend old-age revolving pension bill and asking support of same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5623. Also, petition of F. Davenport and numerous citizens of Toledo, Ohio, urging support of Townsend recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5624. Also, petition of Evelyn Hoffman and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, stating that they will be seriously harmed if either of the public-utility bills (H. R. 5423 or S. 1725) becomes a law as they are unfair, unwise, unnecessary, and discriminatory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5625. Also, petition of Paul Hewetson and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, stating that they would be seriously harmed if the public-utility bills were passed as they are unfair, unwise, unnecessary, and discriminatory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5626. Also, petition of Henry T. Fournies and other citizens of Toledo, Ohio, urging support of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5627. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Don R. Carrigan, Exalted Ruler, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, No. 343, Port Huron Lodge, Port Huron, Mich., and 144 others, requesting the Congress to empower the Department of Justice to investigate all subversive activities of individuals and organizations, alien or otherwise, seeking or planning the overthrow of our Government by force or other unlawful means, and for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the promotion or encouragement of the overthrow of a democratic form of government by force or violence, and other legislation to effectuate the purpose of the petitions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5628. Also, petition of Ferd J. Miller, of Unionville, Mich., and 54 other members of Sebewaing Local, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5629. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Mothers and Daughters' Study Club of Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Labor.

5630. Also, petition of the Effingham Lodge, No. 1016, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5631. Also, petition of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5632. Also, petition of the town of East Providence, R. I.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5633. Also, petition of the city of San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5634. Also, petition of the city of Norway, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5635. Also, petition of the Alteration Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers Union of Greater New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5636. Also, petition of the Tierra Alta Chapter, D. A. R., Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5637. Also, petition of the National Association of Merchant Tailors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5638. Also, petition of the city of Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5639. Also, petition of the Townsend Club, No. 3, of San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5640. Also, petition by the Citizens Joint Committee on Fiscal Relations between the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5641. Also, petition of citizens of Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, and North Dakota, presented by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America, requesting the immediate passage of legislation designed to halt the activities of individuals and organizations within the United States seeking to overthrow the Government by force and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5642. Also, petition of citizens of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Canal Zone, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, and Illinois, presented by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America requesting the immediate passage of legislation designed to halt the activities of individuals and organizations within the United States seeking to overthrow the Government by force and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5643. Also, petition of citizens of the States of Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah, presented by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America, requesting the immediate passage of legislation designed to halt the activities of individuals and organizations within the United States seeking to overthrow the Government by force and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5644. Also, petition of citizens of the States of Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania, presented by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America, requesting the immediate passage of legislation designed to halt the activities of individuals and organizations within the United States seeking to overthrow the Government by force and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5645. Also, petition of citizens of the State of California, presented by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America, requesting the immediate passage of legislation designed to halt the activities of individuals and organizations within the United States seeking to overthrow the Government by force and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1935

(Legislative day of Wednesday, Mar. 13, 1935)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 26, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the California-Pacific International Exposition, San Diego, Calif., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 935) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to lend Army and Navy equipment for use at the national jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent, and ask the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I ask unanimous consent that when the unfinished business shall have been completed, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I am quite in accord with the request, and, therefore, of course, have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bulkley	Couzens	Gore
Ashurst	Bulow	Cutting	Guffey
Austin	Burke	Dickinson	Hale
Bachman	Byrd	Donahey	Harrison
Bankhead	Byrnes	Duffy	Hatch
Barbour	Capper	Fletcher	Hayden
Barkley	Clark	Frazier	King
Bilbo	Connally	George	La Follette
Black	Coolidge	Gerry	Logan
Bone	Copeland	Gibson	Lonergan
Borah	Costigan	Glass	Long
McAdoo	Murray	Robinson	Trammell
McCarran	Neely	Russell	Truman
McGill	Norbeck	Schwellenbach	Tydings
McKellar	Norris	Sheppard	Vandenberg
McNary	Nye	Shipstead	Van Nuys
Maloney	O'Mahoney	Smith	Wagner
Metcalf	Pittman	Steiwer	Walsh
Minton	Pope	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Moore	Radcliffe	Thomas, Utah	White
Murphy	Reynolds	Townsend	

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] are necessarily detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. MCNARY. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on account of illness, that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] is absent on official business, that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] is absent because of a death in his family, and that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

FIVE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SWEDISH RIKSDAG

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 26, 1935.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: A dispatch has been received from the Honorable Laurence A. Steinhardt, American Minister to Sweden, reporting that this year marks the five hundredth anniversary of the Swedish Riksdag, and that a celebration, including elaborate ceremonies, to mark this event will be held from May 27 to May 30 of this year.

This information is being sent to you as of possible interest to the Congress and for whatever action, if any, may be deemed advisable in the circumstances.

Very sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of publications and documents on the files of the Department which are not needed in the conduct of business, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. WAGNER and Mr. NORBECK members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, memorializing Congress not to impose any additional livestock processing taxes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. NORRIS on the 26th instant, p. 4417, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of Nebraska, favoring the enactment of legislation for the purpose of requiring all motor-vehicle fuel to contain ethyl alcohol in a volume of